

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued Feb. 17, 1953
For actions of Feb. 16, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 26

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Access roads.....1 | Farm surplus.....24 | Price supports.....7,25 |
| Adjournment.....6,14 | Fats and oils.....15 | Reclamation.....23 |
| Appropriations.....1 | Fertilizer.....3 | Reorganization.....9 |
| Budgeting.....19 | Foreign aid.....5,8 | Research.....21 |
| Butter.....10 | Foreign trade.....27 | St. Lawrence seaway.....13 |
| Civil service.....1,32 | Forestry.....22 | Taxation.....2,4,18 |
| Dairy industry.....24 | Highways.....1 | T.V.A.....28 |
| Electrification, rural.....11,28 | Investigation.....19 | Tobacco.....27 |
| Expenditures.....4 | Irrigation.....20 | Veterans' benefits.....1 |
| Farm loans.....31 | Loans.....16 | Water conservation.....21 |
| Farm machinery.....3 | Personnel.....17 | Wheat.....12 |
| Farm prices.....24,26 | Price controls.....30 | Wool.....29 |

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported supplemental appropriation bill. House committee voted to report tax-reduction bill. Sen. Thye defended Secretary's recent speech on price supports, and others also discussed this matter.

HOUSE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 3053 (H. Rept. 46), and it was agreed that the measure would be considered Wed. (pp. 1162). The Rules Committee reported a resolution waiving points of order on the bill (p. 1176). The bill includes the following items:

Federal-aid highways, \$185,000,000, to reimburse the States for the Federal share of work done under previous highway authorizations.

Access roads, \$8,000,000, which is for liquidation of prior contract authorizations. A budget estimate of \$23,000,000 had previously been submitted, but the committee report quotes a statement by the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation as follows: "...I cannot approve at this time the \$15,000,000 for new projects. The Commissioner of Public Roads suggested that this estimate be withdrawn pending further review of the certified projects."

Veterans' readjustment benefits, \$75,000,000, which is a reduction of \$131,058,000 in the budget estimate. The committee report states: "The committee feels that the amount recommended is sufficient to carry forward the program until more accurate information as to the real needs can be determined."

Civil Service Commission, \$1,000,000 for investigation of U. S. citizens employed on the staffs of any international organization. The committee report states: "The committee is in accord with the purpose of the estimate...but has required that such funds shall be obtained by transfer from the appropriation to the Department of State for the fiscal year 1953 for Information and Educational Activities."

2. TAX REDUCTION. The Ways and Means Committee voted, 21-4, to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 1, to cut individual income taxes about 10% beginning July 1, 1953 (p. 1165).

3. FERTILIZER; FARM MACHINERY. Chairman Hope, of the Agriculture Committee, announced the appointment of a Subcommittee on Fertilizer and Farm Machinery, as follows: Reps. Hoeven (chairman), Harvey, Belcher, McIntyre, Wampler, Gathings, Abernethy, Albert, and Polk (p. D72).
4. EXPENDITURES; TAXATION. Rep. Dies asked whether the Administration favors budget balancing before tax reduction, Rep. Halleck said budget balancing was primary, and Rep. Rayburn said the position of the Administration is not clear (p. 1165).
5. FOREIGN AID. Reps. Hoffman, Hale, and Mason spoke in favor of limiting foreign-aid spending (pp. 1166-7).
6. ADJOURNED until Wed., Feb. 18 (p. 1176).

SENATE

7. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Thye defended the Secretary's recent speech on price supports, and discussed with Sen. Kerr and others the problem of supporting perishable agricultural commodities (pp. 1138-46).
8. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Douglas spoke in favor of S. 847, to give a portion of our farm surplus to the flood stricken countries of Europe, but was in favor of rereferring the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee (pp. 1134-36).
9. REORGANIZATION. The Rules and Administration Committee reported without amendment S. Res. 56, providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations (S. Rept. 43) (p. 1125).
10. BUTTER. Received a petition from the Minnesota Legislature urging the Government to announce the extension of the present 90 percent support level for butter through 1954 (pp. 1123-24).
11. ELECTRIFICATION. Received a joint resolution of the Alaska Legislature that a hydroelectric power dam and plant be constructed at Devil Canyon on the Susitna River to solve the power problems of the Alaska railbelt (p. 1124).
12. WHEAT. Received a concurrent resolution of the North Dakota Legislature urging the United States to renew the International Wheat Agreement (p. 1124).
13. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY. Sen. Thye submitted an amendment to S. 589, providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and inserted his statement criticizing the bill in its present form (pp. 1129-30).
14. ADJOURNED until Wed., Feb. 18 (p. 1156).

BILLS INTRODUCED

15. FATS AND OILS. H. R. 2915, by Rep. Allen, amends section 2470 of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with the taxation of the first domestic processing of palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and coconut oil; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 1080).
16. LOANS. H. R. 3052, by Rep. Rains, to expand and extend to June 30, 1955, the direct home and farm-house loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor; to Veterans' Affairs Committee (p. 1176).

tion of a political, military, economic, or other order may serve as an excuse for or justification of aggression.

In unprecedented disregard of these treaties and other solemn obligations on the part of the U. S. S. R., the Moscow Government delivered an ultimatum to Lithuania on June 14, 1940, demanding that free entry into the territory of Lithuania be immediately assured for units of the Army of the Soviet Union. Less than 12 hours were given for the reply of the Lithuanian Government. But even before the expiration of this term, armored columns of the Red army flooded Lithuania, as well as two other Baltic States.

All of the methods of sovietization under a people's democracy were first tested in the Baltic countries. The elections to People's Diet, people's government, agrarian reforms, and so forth, were all stage-managed by top officials of the Kremlin installed in Lithuania. The political will of the people was counterfeited by so-called elections of the People's Diet organized under the bayonets of the Red army and the pistols of the Soviet secret police agents.

As soon as the Soviets were established in Lithuania, it was no longer necessary for the Kremlin to distort the true nature of the facts. On June 30, 1940, Molotov bluntly declared that "the traditional Russian policy, practiced since the days of Ivan the Terrible, necessitated the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union." The People's Diet, in its resolution addressed to Moscow, frankly admitted that the "liberation" of Lithuania was accomplished "thanks to the Soviet Union."

I am proud to say that the United States has never recognized the fruits of the Soviet aggression on Lithuania and other Baltic States. On the contrary, it has denounced that act of violence and continues to regard Lithuania as a sovereign and independent republic.

It is to the everlasting credit to this country of ours and especially to the United States Congress which, in the interest of humanity, undertook an historic task to investigate the Katyn massacre. It was proved, beyond any doubt, that the horrible executions were carried out by the same Kremlin rulers who raped the Baltic States.

The massacre of 14,000 Polish officers shook conscience of the world, but millions of people behind the Iron Curtain subjugated and doomed to physical destruction offer an even more frightful example of Soviet crimes.

And I suggest that this Congress should enact necessary legislation to investigate the circumstances under which the seizure of the Baltic States was performed. Special attention deserves the Kremlin-staged elections to People's Diet which are constantly presented by the Soviet Government to the public opinion as justification of the aggression against the Baltic States.

Such an investigation would clearly show to the American public and the other people of the world the true nature of the Red Russian imperialism. It would clear away the confusion now sur-

rounding the subject in the minds of the public.

May I take this opportunity to express my firm conviction that the cause of justice will finally triumph over the forces of enslavement and terror and that Lithuania will soon have her place in the family of free and independent nations.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 35th anniversary of the national independence of Lithuania, and the free people all over the world once again raise their voices in encouragement and sympathy to the people of that valiant democratic republic.

Despite oppression and torture at the hands of Communist forces, the spirit of the once-free Lithuania continues to live and burn brightly in the hearts of her sons and daughters, both within their homeland and abroad. Occupied by totalitarian power, incorporated forcibly into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, deprived of their individual, political, economic, and religious freedoms, the people of Lithuania long for the day when their country will once again resume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It is my hope that in this trying period of their history the people of Lithuania will draw encouragement from the warm regard which our country has held for them. American sympathy with the Lithuanian people has been manifest in our press and in Congress, as well as in the official policy of our Government, first declared on July 23, 1940, which has refused to recognize Soviet Russia's absorption of Lithuania and has persisted in recognition of the established democratic republic.

Mr. Speaker, on this 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence I want to extend my congratulations to the people of that brave country and to all Americans of Lithuanian ancestry. I join in their prayer that the oppression of their native land may soon be ended.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to make these few comments on the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Since a celebration thereof is forbidden in the homeland this year because of Communist aggression, suppression, and tyrannical despotism, it is more important that free people throughout the world join with Lithuanians everywhere in letting them know in no uncertain terms that we not only understand their plight in their homeland, but will do all within our power to ease their burden.

To the 1,000,000 loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent, I say that they are not one bit less patriotic and loyal to the United States by continuing to show a very active interest in their friends and relatives in Lithuania.

It is incumbent upon all of us who love freedom and liberty to devote our lives to the strengthening of the spirit of independence in the hearts of men all over the world.

We must never forget that an attack upon liberty anywhere is an attack upon liberty everywhere.

Let us continue to work together to free the enslaved, no matter where they may be.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express today, on the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence as a modern state, my continuing admiration for and sympathy with the heroic people of that indestructible country.

Lithuania has existed for more than 800 years, a large part of that time under cruel foreign domination. I am convinced that the present illegal incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which never has been recognized by the United States, cannot be—however inhuman it may be for Lithuanians—a permanent setback to the development of Lithuania. The country of Mindaugas and Vytautas can never die.

No, the country can never perish, but its people, many of them, are perishing. We know how more than 50,000 were deported to misery and death in the U. S. S. R. on the night of June 14-15, 1941, and how 3 or 4 times that number, at least, have been deported or exterminated by the Soviet Union since that time.

Oppressive Soviet exploitation is robbing Lithuania of its natural resources as well as of its people. But not, I believe, of its spirit. And certainly not of its friends and well-wishers throughout the free world.

I know that all Americans join me in sending warm greetings to the people of Lithuania on this tragic anniversary. We hope they may have the fortitude and the patience to endure until Lithuania once again takes its rightful place in the community of free nations.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this day, February 16, 35 years ago, the gallant people of Lithuania declared their independence.

From the late 1700's until 1918 her history had been one of continuous subjugation to the Russian Czars. During the First World War Lithuania was invaded by the German forces and remained occupied for a period of over 3 years. On February 16, in the year 1918, Lithuanian independence was proclaimed and she retained her independent status until the outbreak of World War II. During this period the country was forced to accept the quartering of Russian troops along the Baltic coast and in other portions of the country. Later, finding herself helpless, the country was overrun by Russian forces.

Although the largest of the three Baltic countries, Lithuania today is sealed off from the free world by a ring of iron. We know little of what transpires behind that iron curtain save in certain smuggled messages from that indomitable, liberty-loving people still hoping for that day of freedom—that day which will see again Lithuania among the society of the free nations of the world.

To Americans of Lithuanian descent, we hold out the hope that in the near future your anniversary, this 16th day of February, will be celebrated in the man-

ner in which we celebrate our own Fourth of July, celebrating once again Lithuania as a free nation, free from the invader, free from the shackles of slavery, and again free and independent as a democratic nation looking forward to the future with the hope of permanent independence and standing with all free nations under God.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania, one of the first victims of Communist aggression and oppression, has lost its independence but not its spirit.

As Lithuanians here in the United States and throughout the world somberly mark the 35th anniversary of their independence, they may look hopefully to the day when once again the principles of freemen will reign in their land.

Tyranny is weakening while the forces of freedom grow ever stronger.

Communism is being blocked more effectively each new day, and each new day brings new hope for liberation of the oppressed; brings new hope that free peoples everywhere will once more rise from under the aggressor's boot, and enjoy once more the inherent principles of liberty and the dignity of man.

New light of liberty is being cast over those countries darkened by tyranny's expansion. Our Government promises a forceful program of peaceful liberation, and this program, in collaboration with the effective underground movements of Communist-dominated countries, holds promise of evolving the lands of the oppressed into the lands of the free.

While the spirit of independence burns within the breasts of freemen, while an abiding faith promotes the will to be free, no free soul will be conquered; no nation will bow in subjection; liberty will prevail again.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of World War I the gates of liberty were opened for the people of Lithuania. On February 16, 1918, the National Council of Lithuania—Lietuvos Taryba—proclaimed Lithuania a free and independent nation. Thirty-five years later the people of Lithuanian ancestry are happy to observe this historic occasion. Conversely they also observe with sympathy and deep sorrow the 13th anniversary of the illegal reoccupation of their country.

During the interval of Lithuania's independence—to wit, 22 years—that nation made many contributions to the civilized world. Unfortunately, however, this period of freedom and liberty was cut short on the 14th day of June 1940, when Soviet Russia demanded that the Lithuanian Government become sympathetic and subservient to the Soviet Union. On June 15 of that year the Soviet Army marched into that brave country and occupied it. Shortly thereafter, as we have seen so often in numerous other countries, the Soviet-sponsored and supervised government brought into creation a puppet state subservient and obligated to the will of Soviet dictator Marshal Stalin. Since that ignominious day the Lithuanian people have suffered brutal and inhuman exploitation by the powers of the Soviet Government.

Little do we realize the hardship, pain, and suffering which those brave people endured under the ruthless heel of the Soviet Government. Thousands upon thousands of their citizens have been thrown into slave-labor camps and gradually eliminated through inhuman treatment.

Indeed, we are fortunate today that the new President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has proclaimed to the entire world that we will no longer tolerate the secret treaties, which have enslaved millions of other people—to the detriment of those behind the iron curtain. This policy, as enunciated by the press, should give faith and comfort to those who have been persecuted by the Soviet Union; and it is earnestly hoped that a severe program toward the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will eventually bring about the liberation not only of the Lithuanian people but all the peoples of the Baltic States.

Freedom-loving peoples of the world do not recognize the illegal annexation of Lithuania and continue to recognize the governments in exile throughout the world. The American people shall always stand in deep sympathy, and with respect, for the sacrifices being made by the Lithuanian people. Their courageous and firm stand against the unauthorized subjugation by Russia shall some day affirm itself by reestablishing a free and independent Lithuania.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of Lithuania's independence I am happy to have the opportunity of renewed expression of my great admiration for the people of Lithuania and the steadfastness and courage that have been theirs in the resistance of oppression during many trying periods.

I accompanied the Lithuanian-American delegation to the funeral of President Harding, and through the good fortune of acquaintance with the military in charge of arrangements was able to have placed at the head of the presidential casket the Lithuanian floral offering. This, it seemed to me, was appropriate and as the fallen President would have wished, since the grief of the Lithuanians was real, President Harding having been the friend of their cause.

Men and women of Lithuanian blood have made large contributions to the city of Chicago. I have been signally fortunate in numbering many of these good citizens among my friends, among them Leonora Nimhosk—now Mrs. Gatewood and the mother of a fine family of children—and her fine and noble father and mother, both born in Lithuania. Leonora Nimhosk was my coworker and secretary when in the name of the radio circle of the Rebuilders we were doing our best to leaven in some degree the distress of the great depression. It is of such blood as that of the immigrants who came from Lithuania, as did Mr. and Mrs. Nimhosk, her parents, that our United States of America has derived much strength. I might remark, Mr. Speaker, that one of our outstanding and beloved jurists in Chicago is a Lithuanian-American, himself a native

son of Chicago, his parents immigrants from Lithuania.

It is the destiny of Lithuania to be free, because it is not in the character of the Lithuanian people to accept bondage. Someday—and I have faith it will be soon—the Soviet clouds will be lifted and the sun again will shine, unhindered and unobstructed on the land of Lithuania.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer for a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 63) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 25,000 additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, 82d Congress, 2d session, of which 20,000 copies shall be for the House document room, 3,000 copies for the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the Senate Committee on Judiciary, and 1,000 copies for the House Committee on Judiciary.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1953 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 46) which was read a first time and second time, and, with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to take up the 1953 supplemental appropriation bill on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I believe that the rules require the report to lay over for 3 legislative days. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct, but I have taken the matter up with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and with the full committee. Everyone on the committee is agreeable to this procedure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As I say, I shall not object, but I do hope the leadership on the majority side will not make a practice of this on future appropriation bills.

Mr. TABER. We will not do it on the regular appropriation bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1953.

EGYPT AND BRITAIN TO BURY HATCHET

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an article from the Boston Herald of Friday which praises the United States Ambassador, Jefferson Caffery, and the work that he has done to get Egypt and Britain to bury the hatchet. His accomplishment is of great value to the peace of the world. In days when the foreign service has been so severely criticized at times, I am glad to point out that we have in our service men of great integrity and ability. It was thought that this Anglo-Egyptian agreement could not be reached, but the matter has been adjusted. We are very grateful for this achievement.

(The following is the article referred to:)

EGYPT, BRITAIN TO BURY HATCHET—AGREE ON SUDANESE—UNITED STATES ENVOY LAUDED
(By Edward Pollak)

CAIRO, EGYPT, February 12.—Egypt and Britain formally agreed today to let the Sudanese choose their own future and Premier Gen. Mohammed Naguib announced the door was opened wide for a successful understanding on the withdrawal of British troops from the Suez Canal zone.

Talks on Suez are coming very soon, Naguib said.

PARADE PLANNED

The final settlement of these two key problems in British-Egyptian relations could clear the way toward tighter cooperation between this strategic Moslem nation and the Western Powers in the cold war, perhaps in a Middle East defense command.

There was exultation in the foreign offices of Cairo, London, and Washington. And a public holiday was called for tomorrow in the Sudan, a land of desert, forests, and cotton fields that stretches from central Africa to the Red Sea. A ceremonial parade of celebration is to be held before Gov. Gen. Sir Robert Howe Saturday in Khartoum, the capital.

Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, in announcing the Sudanese accord in Britain's House of Commons, said it was a reasonable settlement of this question which has long bedeviled our relations with Egypt.

Press officer Michael J. McDermott of the United States State Department said in Washington the United States is highly gratified. He termed this "an event of great importance, representing as it does agreement on an issue which has been the cause of great complications in relations between the two countries for several decades."

Here in Cairo, United States Ambassador Jefferson Caffery drew praise from Naguib for his mediation efforts.

"It was through Ambassador Caffery's good offices," the Premier said, "that many difficult points were ironed out. These had a direct effect on the successful conclusion of this agreement."

DESIGNATION OF MEMBER TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS ON FEBRUARY 23, 1953

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to on February 9, 1953, the Chair designates the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 23, 1953.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the permanent RECORD following those of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] on February 12 at page 1062 of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DISASTER IN HOLLAND, BELGIUM, AND ENGLAND

(Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are torn by the devastation being wrought by the North Sea in the gallant countries of Holland, of Belgium, and of the eastern shores of England. We have seen the TV and motion pictures and been horror struck by the fury and the ravages of the storms. We have seen also the quick response of the Queen and the Queen Mother in Holland in the midst of that devastation. We have read of the young Queen of England and her tireless efforts to help her people. That such tragedy should come to England during the first year of her reign is sad indeed.

It was my privilege as Ohio vice regent of Mt. Vernon to share with the other members of the Ladies' Association in the welcome given the then Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh at the home of Mr. Washington. It was again my privilege in the absence of the regent to welcome there her Majesty Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard. Her simple graciousness to the groups of Girl Scouts assembled on the lawn will be remembered always.

Her Majesty's deep understanding of young hearts was exquisitely demon-

strated when she wrote a most charming note to little Mary Brumbaugh in Painesville, Ohio. Mary had written Her Majesty suggesting that she visit her in her home there so that she might see how the simple people of this country really live.

And now these two young women, already carrying the heavy burden of the welfare of their people, are called upon to uphold them through the most appalling tragedy that has befallen their countries in centuries.

The resolution I had the privilege of introducing in an attempt to express the sympathy felt by Congress, did not itself reach the floor. The House, in order to bring action at the first possible moment accepted the Senate's resolution unanimously. But in the meantime, after consultation with the two Embassies, I took it upon myself as an American woman to cable the two women whose hearts must be exceedingly heavy with the suffering of their people that they might know that the women of America had them in heart and mind, asking the Infinite to grant them wisdom and strength, endurance, and fortitude.

THE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. LAIRD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

NAVAL ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

(Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the past fortnight there has been much public discussion with respect to imposing a blockade against the traffic of war materials entering the ports of China. Everybody concurs that it is highly improper for members of the United Nations to engage in this traffic which has been of immeasurable benefit to North Korea and Communist China against whom the United Nations is engaged in open hostilities. Some persons have asserted that the responsibility for a blockade should be assumed by the United States Navy; others that it should be a joint undertaking by the fleets of the United Nations. There appears to have been no serious consideration to the imposition of a blockade by the Republic of China itself, which is the one government in the world which has the unquestioned right of blockade but lacks the naval vessels to carry it out.

In 1946 the Seventy-ninth Congress authorized the transfer of 271 vessels from the United States Navy to the Republic of China of various types of craft but specifically excluding those vessels of a combat character. The authority of that act expired by its own limitations in July of 1951.

In order that the Republic of China might have vessels capable of conducting a blockade of the Chinese ports, I have today introduced a bill authorizing the President to transfer by sale, lease, or otherwise, to the Republic of China under certain conditions, a total of six destroyers which I understand the Republic of China is presently capable of manning and provisioning.

To forestall any speculation as to the origin of this proposal, I must assert that its genesis is from my own consideration of the problem and is not inspired by any persons in the Executive Department either civilian or professional. Being confident that it is the preponderance of feeling in the Congress that our Government should extend to the Republic of China all military aid by way of training facilities and equipment that is possible, it seems entirely appropriate that such a program should also include naval vessels appropriate to the needs in that area.

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution, to provide a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives.

There is widespread feeling that a longer term for Representatives would add stability to the House and assure better service to the home districts.

Increased responsibilities and complexity of the problems we face today, Membership in Congress has definitely become a full-time job. Despite the pressures of their work, the Members are necessarily compelled to devote considerable time at campaigning. This means that a Member at present has only 1 year of his term to devote entirely and completely to the performance of his duties.

I do not feel that it is a healthy situation to have the whole Membership seeking reelection at the same time. My resolution would avoid that by staggering the commencement of the 4-year term, with the result that about half the Membership would be up for reelection on a biennial basis.

Those not seeking reelection during the 2-year intervals, could devote their usual full time to issues before the Congress. The people would, therefore, be assured that a majority of the membership would be functioning—unencumbered by time-consuming requirements and political pressures of election years.

By staggering the terms of office on the basis of even-numbered and odd-numbered districts, the people would retain the privilege of voting for approximately half their representation every 2 years.

I believe that with the adoption of this amendment, the same close contact between the Representative and his constituency would be maintained and that economy and efficiency would result to the benefit of all concerned.

DR. JOHN McLOUGHLIN AND REV. JASON LEE

(Mr. COON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress two great Oregon pioneers, Dr. John McLoughlin and Rev. Jason Lee. They have done much in blazing the path for and shaping the destinies of all Oregonians, and we are grateful to them. I feel it is most fitting therefore that their statues have been placed in the United States Capitol to stand among other noted leaders in our Nation's history.

The ceremony for the presentation of these two statues was held on Saturday, February 14, on the 94th anniversary of Oregon's admission as a State in 1859. The statues were officially presented by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, who has recently resigned as Governor of the great State of Oregon, to accept the duties and office of Secretary of the Interior. We are happy to have him here and feel honored to have him make this presentation, and also to have Vice President RICHARD NIXON accept these fine statues on behalf of the United States.

Fine addresses were also given at this ceremony by outstanding Oregon citizens. Mr. Leslie M. Scott, who from 1941 to 1948 served as State treasurer for Oregon, and who is director of the Oregon Historical Society, delivered an address entitled "John McLoughlin, Benefactor of Oregon Settlers." Dr. G. Herbert Smith, president of the Willamette University, of Salem, Oreg., gave an address entitled "Jason Lee, Missionary and Colonizer," while Dr. Burt Brown Barker, chairman of the Oregon Statuary Committee and vice president of the University of Oregon, gave an address entitled "Oregon, the Unique Prize."

I feel that as the Members of the Congress pass daily through the Halls of our great Capitol, they will see these statues and catch the fine spirit and inspiration of these early pioneer leaders.

February 14, 1953, the 94th anniversary of the signing of the bill admitting Oregon to the Union, is the appropriate time chosen for Oregon to present to the Nation, to stand in the Capitol, statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and Rev. Jason Lee. These are two great men, men of whom Oregon can well be proud. To them can justly be credited more than to any other individuals the peaceful development, settlement, and civilization of the Oregon Territory and of the State of Oregon. Greater than their tremendous worth as individuals, however, is their importance as symbols of the democratic and republican tradition, common to all the United States, but shining forth particularly in the history of Oregon, and exemplified in the careers of these two men.

Dr. McLoughlin, local representative of the Hudson's Bay Company, constituted in his person the sole business and, since the Hudson's Bay Company was British, the sole governmental authority in the entire Columbia River region from the

time of his appointment in 1824 until shortly before the time of his resignation, 1845.

It was under his mild and just paternalistic rule that the region grew from a wilderness of savages to a settled country, learned to govern itself and built schools and churches, and passed peacefully from British rule to joint rule, and from joint rule to American territorial status. McLoughlin himself, though faithful to his company and to the sovereignty of Britain so long as they held claim to the territory, chose to remain an Oregonian when Britain accepted the 49th parallel as the boundary line west of the Rockies, took his oath of allegiance to the United States, and died in his home in Oregon City September 3, 1857.

Dr. McLoughlin was noted for the welcome he gave to missionaries of all faiths, and the substantial help he afforded to them, and to the farmers whose coming spelled ruin to the business of the Hudson's Bay Company's fur business. In the long view, as anyone can see now, but few could see then, he could not have prevented the coming of missionaries, and the settling of the land by American pioneer farmers. He could easily have made their hard life far more difficult for them—which would have brought on a stubborn and perhaps bloody conflict, and probably hastened the inevitable establishment of American sovereignty over the region. He had the statesmanship, with the peace not only of the Oregon Territory, but even of the British Empire and the United States depending on his actions, to act and speak with unflinching firmness, tact, and wisdom, so as to maintain the business of his company and the authority of his government to the last possible moment, and yet to make the transition from authoritative to democratic government, from British to American sovereignty, smooth and easy.

One of the glories of Dr. McLoughlin's career was his hearty welcome of the Reverend Jason Lee, Methodist missionary, and his four companions, who came to the Oregon Territory in 1834. The missionaries came by the Oregon Trail, except for a slight detour at one point to avoid hostile Indians, and it is particularly gratifying to me, representing the eastern portion of Oregon, to retrace in memory their path, along the line now followed by the rails of the Union Pacific, from Huntington to Baker and then to La Grande, and then, on a less simply described route, up to old Fort Walla Walla at what is now Wallula, Wash.

With Dr. McLoughlin's help and advice, Lee established his mission on the Willamette. Going back east in 1838, Lee made speaking tours, talked with the governing body of the Methodist Church, and secured the presentation of a petition to Congress, signed by his fellow missionaries and other dwellers in his mission on the Willamette. Through these efforts, he enlisted support for the Oregon venture, and returned to Oregon with a party of 51, establishing a new and more ambitious mission, 10 miles south of the first one, and still on the Willamette. There he set up a saw mill and grist mill, with machinery he had

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

FEBRUARY 16, 1953.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

MR. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3053]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations to supply certain supplemental and deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The estimates upon which the bill is based are contained in House Document Nos. 62, 66, and 87. The bill is divided into chapters corresponding to the subcommittees considering the estimates. The recommendations contained in the bill are a result of deliberations of the several subcommittees as approved by the full committee.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Budget estimates considered by the committee total \$2,313,719,590. Appropriations recommended total \$904,672,920, a reduction of \$1,409,046,670. In addition to this reduction, a recommended rescission of \$1,000,000 for "Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief," Veterans Administration, has been approved. These amounts are distributed by chapters of the bill as indicated in the following table:

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

| Chapter | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with estimates |
|---------|----------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| I | Legislative and Judiciary----- | \$1, 042, 090 | \$942, 920 | —\$99, 170 |
| II | State, Justice and Commerce----- | 221, 620, 000 | 201, 600, 000 | —20, 020, 000 |
| III | Treasury----- | 2, 300, 000 | 750, 000 | —1, 550, 000 |
| IV | Labor-Federal Security----- | 406, 087, 000 | 373, 950, 000 | —32, 137, 000 |
| V | Interior----- | 870, 000 | 396, 000 | —474, 000 |
| VI | Independent offices----- | 481, 800, 500 | 327, 034, 000 | —154, 766, 500 |
| VII | Civil functions----- | (¹) | (¹) | ----- |
| VIII | Defense----- | 1, 200, 000, 000 | ----- | —1, 200, 000, 000 |
| | Total----- | 2, 313, 719, 590 | 904, 672, 920 | —1, 409, 046, 670 |

¹ Language changes only.

CHAPTER I

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIARY

SUBCOMMITTEE

WALT HORAN, Washington, *Chairman*

FRED E. BUSBEY, Illinois
FRANK T. BOW, Ohio

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The bill includes \$500,000 for the salaries and expenses of special and select committees authorized by the House and \$99,620 for various items set forth in the table which follows.

THE JUDICIARY

Fees of commissioners.—The committee has allowed \$107,000, the full amount of the budget estimate. The workload of commissioners cannot be administratively controlled and fees are set by law.

Fees of jurors.—The committee has allowed \$200,000, the full amount of the request. As in the previous item practically no administrative control of these costs is possible.

Miscellaneous salaries.—The committee has allowed \$20,600 of the request for \$39,100, a reduction of \$18,500. The request included \$18,500 for salaries of employees of judges whose appointments are anticipated. The committee disallowed this portion of the request pending more concrete basis for estimating such costs. The remaining portion of the request was based on demonstrable increases in workload during the past several months.

Travel expenses.—The committee has disallowed the request for \$17,500 for this item. Information which has come to the attention of the committee strongly indicates that a few judges have abused the special privileges they have been granted with regard to charging for subsistence expenses. The committee directs that a statement be prepared showing travel costs of each circuit judge for the calendar year 1952, set up in the same format as the statement available to the committee with respect to 1951 travel costs.

Salaries of court reporters.—The committee has allowed the request for \$15,700. These additional funds are necessary because of a demonstrated increase in the business of the courts.

Salaries of referees.—The committee has allowed the request for \$134,000 to provide for an increase in salaries authorized by the Judicial Conference of the United States in accordance with the authority given them by Public Law 457, approved July 7, 1952.

The funds for salaries of referees in bankruptcy are paid from a special fund derived from fees paid by parties to bankruptcy proceedings. This is, therefore, not an appropriation from the general funds of the Treasury.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with estimates |
|----------------|--|-----------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| | LEGISLATIVE BRANCH | | | |
| | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | | | |
| | Beneficiaries of deceased members----- | ----- | \$37, 500 | +\$37, 500 |
| | CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE | | | |
| 87 | Furniture----- | \$58, 750 | 58, 750 | ----- |
| 87 | Special and select committees----- | 600, 000 | 500, 000 | -100, 000 |
| 87 | Stationery (revolving fund)----- | 800 | 800 | ----- |
| | CAPITOL POLICE | | | |
| 87 | Capitol Police Board----- | 670 | ----- | -670 |
| | EDUCATION OF SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES | | | |
| 87 | Education of Senate, House, and Supreme Court pages----- | 2, 570 | 2, 570 | ----- |
| | Total, legislative branch----- | 662, 790 | 599, 620 | -63, 170 |

THE JUDICIARY

OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

| | | | | |
|----|---|-------------|------------|----------|
| 62 | Fees of commissioners----- | 107, 000 | 107, 000 | ----- |
| 62 | Fees of jurors----- | 200, 000 | 200, 000 | ----- |
| 62 | Miscellaneous salaries----- | 39, 100 | 20, 600 | -18, 500 |
| 62 | Travel expenses----- | 17, 500 | ----- | -17, 500 |
| 62 | Salaries of court reporters----- | 15, 700 | 15, 700 | ----- |
| 62 | Salaries of referees (special account)----- | (134, 000) | (134, 000) | ----- |
| | Total, the judiciary----- | 379, 300 | 343, 300 | -36, 000 |
| | Total, chapter I----- | 1, 042, 090 | 942, 920 | -99, 170 |

CHAPTER II

STATE, JUSTICE AND COMMERCE

SUBCOMMITTEE

CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio, *Chairman*

FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., New York
FRANK T. BOW, Ohio
SAM COON, Oregon

JOHN J. ROONEY, New York
PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR., Georgia
ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Salaries and expenses.—The requested supplemental appropriation of \$360,000 to provide for the additional workload in consular activities occasioned by passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act and for an increase in the cost of foreign exchange is denied. The regular 1953 Act provided \$76,000,000 for "Salaries and expenses", and the committee feels that by reprogramming the Department should be able to absorb the additional expenditures necessary for the above purposes.

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico—Construction.—The bill includes \$2,500,000, the amount of the budget estimate to provide additional funds to meet contractors' earnings on the previously authorized construction of the Falcon Dam during the present fiscal year, and so as to permit completion of the structure by November, 1953, the date stipulated in the Water Treaty of 1944.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The committee received testimony concerning the request for \$200,000 additional for fees and expenses of witnesses appearing on behalf of the Government in court cases. It was stated that the additional funds are necessitated by the increase in criminal cases.

The committee also heard testimony on the supplemental request for \$600,000 for "Support of United States prisoners". It was testified that this additional amount is needed to meet increased costs of \$551,000 for boarding Federal prisoners in non-Federal jails while awaiting trial or serving sentences of short duration and to meet increased costs of \$49,000 for maintenance and operation of jails in the Territory of Alaska.

No funds are included in this bill for either of the above items inasmuch as the committee was advised by letter dated February 9, 1953, from the Attorney General as follows:

The estimates for "Fees and Expenses of Witnesses" and "Support of United States Prisoners" have been considered by me and are justified as submitted. However, if the Committee will authorize the Attorney General to make transfers within the present appropriations, we will undertake to save an equal amount from moneys appropriated for other Departmental activities.

The committee wishes to give the Department every opportunity to make these savings and upon receipt of information from the Department as to which transfers are requested, the committee will make the necessary recommendations.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses.—The committee received testimony from the Immigration and Naturalization Service on February 4th concerning the request for \$1,725,000 additional for this Service, as contained in House Document No. 62, dated January 13, 1953, to carry out its broadened responsibilities under the new Immigration and Nationality Act.

The committee was advised by letter dated February 9, 1953, from the Attorney General as follows:

In reviewing the estimate for the Immigration and Naturalization Service I find that the Service has accumulated a substantial saving in its first six months' operation of the current fiscal year. Furthermore, I find that the Service has not yet had sufficient experience in operating under the new Public Law 414 for us to say with any certainty just what additional expenses will be involved during the balance of this fiscal year. I have instructed the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization to endeavor to carry on the additional burdens imposed by Public Law 414 within presently available funds, making whatever transfers from unexpended funds in other accounts that are necessary for the purpose. Accordingly, we are withdrawing in the interests of governmental economy the request for a supplemental appropriation of \$1,725,000 made by the previous administration.

Accordingly, no funds are recommended herein for this item.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Establishment of air-navigation facilities.—In September, 1952, a typhoon destroyed or damaged certain air-navigation facilities and community service facilities on Wake Island, the principal intermediate point on the Central Pacific air route for commercial and Korean airlift traffic.

House Document No. 62 contained a request for \$4,600,000 for the rehabilitation of these facilities. This request was reduced to \$3,250,000 by the new officials of the Department of Commerce. The committee recommends \$2,500,000 which should provide for the restoration of the air-navigation facilities and the most necessary community facilities.

Federal-aid Airport Program, Federal Airport Act.—The bill includes \$3,500,000 for an additional amount for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for airport projects.

PATENT OFFICE

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes \$100,000 additional for this item in order to meet increased charges for printing and reproduction by the Government Printing Office. The amount recommended is a reduction of \$35,000 in the budget estimate and represents the revised request of the new Department officials.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Federal-aid Highways.—The committee recommends \$185,000,000, the amount of the budget estimate for this item. This supplemental amount is necessary to reimburse the States for the Federal share of work done under previous Federal-aid highway authorizations. The sum of \$325,000,000 has already been provided in the regular Department of Commerce Appropriation Act for this fiscal year. Inasmuch as the substantive legislation gives the Bureau of Roads authority to incur obligations, the necessary funds to meet such obligations must be provided when payments become due. The unusually favorable construction season accelerated the road building program considerably during the past season and accordingly expenditures for highway work will be much greater during the present fiscal year than in the preceding year.

Access Roads (Act of September 7, 1950).—The committee received testimony concerning the request of \$23,000,000 for this item as contained in House Document No. 62. Upon request of the committee, the following information was submitted by the Under Secretary for Transportation of the Department of Commerce:

The amount of \$23,000,000 for Access Roads, as previously transmitted, was made up of \$8,000,000 for liquidation of contract authorization and \$15,000,000 for certified access roads projects. The \$8,000,000 for liquidation is approved and included herein. I cannot approve at this time the \$15,000,000 for new projects. The Commissioner of Public Roads suggested that this estimate be withdrawn pending further review of the certified projects.

In view of the above information the committee recommends \$8,000,000 for this item, which is for the liquidation of prior contract authorizations.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimate | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with estimates |
|----------------|---|-------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| | DEPARTMENT OF STATE | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses..... | \$360, 000 | ----- | —\$360, 000 |
| 62 | International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: Construction..... | 2, 500, 000 | \$2, 500, 000 | ----- |
| | Total, Department of State..... | 2, 860, 000 | 2, 500, 000 | —360, 000 |
| | DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE | | | |
| | LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION | | | |
| 62 | Fees and expenses of witnesses..... | 200, 000 | ----- | —200, 000 |
| | IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses..... | 1, 725, 000 | ----- | —1, 725, 000 |
| | FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM | | | |
| 62 | Support of United States prisoners..... | 600, 000 | ----- | —600, 000 |
| | Total, Department of Justice..... | 2, 525, 000 | ----- | —2, 525, 000 |

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill—Con.

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with estimates |
|----------------|---|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| | DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE | | | |
| | CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION | | | |
| 62 | Establishment of air-navigation facilities----- | \$4, 600, 000 | \$2, 500, 000 | —\$2, 100, 000 |
| 62 | Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act----- | 3, 500, 000 | 3, 500, 000 | ----- |
| | PATENT OFFICE | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses----- | 135, 000 | 100, 000 | —35, 000 |
| | BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS | | | |
| 62 | Federal-aid highways----- | 185, 000, 000 | 185, 000, 000 | ----- |
| 62 | Access roads (Act of Sept. 7, 1950)----- | 23, 000, 000 | 8, 000, 000 | —15, 000, 000 |
| | Total, Department of Commerce----- | 216, 235, 000 | 199, 100, 000 | —17, 135, 000 |
| | Total, chapter II----- | 221, 620, 000 | 201, 600, 000 | —20, 020, 000 |

CHAPTER III

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

SUBCOMMITTEE

GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey, *Chairman*

EARL WILSON, Indiana

BENJAMIN F. JAMES, Pennsylvania

CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois

J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia

OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana

ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, New Jersey

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

The supplemental appropriation of \$2,300,000 requested for the Bureau of the Public Debt is attributable to the fact that a greater number of bonds will reach maturity during the current year than during the preceding year and that some 16 million may be presented for redemption.

During the current year, 68 million E bonds are maturing as compared with 28 million in 1952. It has been found that about 30 percent of the maturing bonds are presented for redemption at or shortly after maturity and that the remaining 70 percent are being held for longer periods of time. As the advantages of holding matured bonds are better understood by the holders of such bonds it is possible that redemption estimates will not be realized.

Apportionments of the \$51,000,000 appropriated for this activity for fiscal year 1953 are as follows: 1st quarter \$14,076,850; 2nd quarter \$12,742,650; 3rd quarter \$12,734,550; and 4th quarter \$11,445,950. Actual obligations for the 1st quarter were \$13,987,233, and for the 2nd quarter \$11,610,974, or \$1,221,293 less than the apportionments. Slightly more than one-half of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year has been obligated for the first half of the fiscal year, indicating the necessity for some supplemental funds. Justifications indicate that estimates have been on the liberal side and while it is not the purpose of the committee to deny funds required for the prompt and efficient operation of the Bureau it is proposed to encourage an economic operation. On the assumption that estimates are on the liberal side and that redemption expectations may not be realized the committee feels that an additional appropriation in the amount of \$750,000 should be sufficient to enable the Bureau to perform its functions during the rest of fiscal year 1953 in an efficient manner, and so recommends.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with estimates |
|----------------|---|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| 62 | TREASURY DEPARTMENT Bureau of the Public Debt..... | \$2, 300, 000 | \$750, 000 | —\$1, 550, 000 |

CHAPTER IV

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY

SUBCOMMITTEE

FRED E. BUSBEY, Illinois, *Chairman*

BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa
HAMER H. BUDGE, Idaho

JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island
ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses.—The committee allowed none of the request for \$206,000. These funds were requested to provide for the administrative expenses of establishing and supervising the program of veterans' unemployment compensation provided for by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. Especially since this program is so closely integrated administratively with the regular unemployment compensation program which is supervised by this Bureau, the committee is of the opinion that the additional administrative costs attributable to the new program should be relatively small and can be absorbed within the \$4,983,000 already appropriated under this head.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration.—The committee has allowed \$6,750,000 of the request for \$8,750,000, a reduction of \$2,000,000. The major part of the request was to provide funds for (1) an increase in the average salary of State employees, (2) an increase in benefit claim loads, and (3) administration of the new program for unemployment compensation of veterans under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. During the first half of the fiscal year the benefit claim load was demonstrably higher than was anticipated at the time the regular 1953 budget was acted upon; however, the committee is of the opinion that the Bureau's workload estimates for the last half of the year are somewhat high in view of the outlook for high employment and little indication of major work stoppages. Witnesses stated that the estimate of funds needed for payment of veterans benefits has been revised downward since the request for funds was submitted to Congress. This should also result in a reduction in administrative costs below the estimate presented to the committee.

Unemployment compensation for veterans.—The committee has allowed \$27,200,000 of the request for \$32,200,000, a reduction of \$5,000,000. The amount allowed is exactly equal to the latest estimate of payments to be required in 1953, made by the Bureau of Employment Security. Under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 payments must be made to all eligible applicants in accordance with mathematical formulas, thus these costs to the Federal Government are beyond administrative control.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses.—The committee has approved requested language to transfer \$150,000 to this item from other appropriations for the purpose of continuing the "old" Consumers' Price Index for the months of January through June 1953. Funds had previously been provided on the basis that this index would be discontinued when the revised index was published beginning with January 1953. Difficulties are anticipated with regard to labor contracts tied to the "old" index if that index were discontinued. Representatives of both labor and management have therefore made strong requests for its continuation for a six months' period. The committee certainly does not desire to take any action that might result in serious disruption of labor-management relations in some of our most important industries and has therefore granted the full request.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Salaries and expenses.—The committee has disallowed the entire amount of \$289,000 which was requested for the purpose of carrying out the Office of Education's responsibilities under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. That Act provides that in connection with the education and training program the Commissioner of Education " * * * shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations * * *" and provides that the services of the Office of Education be utilized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in discharging certain of his responsibilities in connection with negotiating agreements with State and local agencies, reviewing State plans of operation and developing State and local policies, standards, etc. Except for publication of the list of accrediting agencies, all of this work is strictly of an advisory nature with all authority for action vested in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The justifications for this request for funds stated:

* * * it is the function of the Office of Education to make a complete and detailed review of the operations of each of these State approving Agencies.

If the Act provided that the Office perform this function the request for funds would not be quite so amazing. But the Act does not so provide nor does either the House or Senate committee's report on the bill indicate that it was their intention that this function be performed by the Office of Education. The Commissioner of Education cited a communication from an employee of one of the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House but it is doubtful, to say the least, that this could be interpreted as indicating the intent of Congress. Congressional intent is very specifically set forth in the Act in section 263 which states:

No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this title, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State approving agency * * *

In the face of these facts the Office of Education had the temerity to ask for funds to hire 3 more G. S. 15s, 4 more G. S. 14s, 15 more G. S. 13s and a retinue of lesser employees. The Bureau of the

Budget is guilty of gross neglect of duty in approving such an utterly ridiculous request and sending it to the Congress.

In the course of the hearings on this request it was brought out that 179 of the Office's current employees are authorized to travel, that they have budgeted \$211,460 for these employees travel (not including \$24,200 in the supplemental request and \$30,300 for which the appropriation is reimbursed) and that as high as 40 employees travel to a single meeting. The committee directs that the Commissioner take immediate steps to have prepared, for submission to the committee at the time of the hearings on the 1954 budget, a statement which will include (1) a list of meetings attended by three or more employees during calendar year 1952, the purpose of each and the total travel cost of each borne by this appropriation, and (2) a list of the employees (except those who were employed exclusively in the Division of Vocational Education) whose travel expense borne by this appropriation totaled more than \$1,000 during the calendar year 1952, the cost of each trip made during the year, and the purpose of each trip.

Payments to school districts.—The committee has disallowed the entire request for \$24,000,000. This appropriation, under which \$40,000,000 has already been made available for 1953, provides funds for operation and maintenance of schools located in Federally affected areas as provided for in Public Law 847. It was testified that during the peak of World War II less than 500 school districts received similar Federal assistance. At the present time 2,300 receive assistance under this appropriation. Testimony and reports received by the committee leaves no doubt that there are a very great many cases where these funds go to school districts where it is obvious that local income could care for the situation.

School construction.—The committee has disallowed the entire request for \$1,250,000 to be made available for salaries and expenses of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for technical services in connection with school construction under Public Law 815. Under the guise of a supplemental request for 1953, this committee was asked to approve funds for this agency's salaries and expenses for 1954 and even \$168,500 for 1955 expenses. Only \$144,000 of the request was for 1953. The Agency estimated this amount, in addition to the \$750,000 already available, would be needed for 130 man-years of employment. Less than half of this staff fall in the engineering category. Items set forth by the agency itself as administrative and general services total one-fourth of the staff charged to this activity and the committee suspects that other categories such as, "field coordination", "Regional Representatives" and "financial analysis and control" should be added in as being at least partially administrative overhead. If it were not for the fact that the major part of the \$750,000 already made available has been obligated, the committee would not only have denied the request for additional funds but would have reduced the funds already provided.

None of the reduction made in this item is to be applied to reduce the engineering personnel or the funds for the travel of such personnel budgeted for this activity.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Hospitals and medical care.—The committee has disallowed the entire request for \$642,000 for grants to Hawaii. This request was purely an appeal for restoration of funds denied by the 82d Congress. The principal witness admitted there was not one new basic factor in the situation.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.—The committee has allowed \$2,000,000 of the \$4,360,000 requested as an increase in the amount authorized to be spent for this purpose from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. The 1952 amendments to the Social Security Act substantially increased the work of the Bureau during 1953. For instance, it has been necessary to convert 4,600,000 accounts to the new scale of benefits and an estimated 165,000 new claims will be received for processing during the year as a direct result of more persons being eligible under the new law. The committee believes that it will be possible for the Bureau to cut unit costs somewhat and absorb part of the cost within the \$60,500,000 already available but it is obvious that more funds must be provided if undue delay in processing claims is to be avoided.

Grants to States for public assistance.—The committee has allowed the full amount of \$340,000,000 requested. The expenditure of these funds is governed by mathematical formulas prescribed by law. Since nothing can possibly be gained by cutting this item, the committee has accepted the best estimate of the professionals in this field.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with estimates |
|----------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | DEPARTMENT OF LABOR | | | |
| | BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses..... | \$206, 000 | ----- | —\$206, 000 |
| 62 | Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration..... | 8, 750, 000 | \$6, 750, 000 | —2, 000, 000 |
| 62 | Unemployment compensation for veterans..... | 32, 200, 000 | 27, 200, 000 | —5, 000, 000 |
| | BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS | | | |
| | Salaries and expenses..... | ¹ (150, 000) | ¹ (150, 000) | ----- |
| | Total, Department of Labor..... | 41, 156, 000 | 33, 950, 000 | —7, 206, 000 |
| | FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY | | | |
| | OFFICE OF EDUCATION | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses..... | 289, 000 | ----- | —289, 000 |
| 62 | Payments to school districts..... | 24, 000, 000 | ----- | —24, 000, 000 |
| 62 | School construction..... | ² (1, 250, 000) | ----- | (—1, 250, 000) |
| | PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE | | | |
| 62 | Hospitals and medical care..... | 642, 000 | ----- | —642, 000 |

¹ To be derived by transfer.² Increase in administrative expense limitation.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SUBCOMMITTEE

BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa, Chairman

IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania
HAMER H. BUDGE, Idaho

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Research in the utilization of saline water.—Of the \$275,000 requested, an appropriation of \$50,000 is recommended for contracts with research institutions and private firms for work on treatment of saline water.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Management of lands and resources.—An appropriation of \$60,000 has been allowed, a reduction of \$40,000 in the request of \$100,000. The amount allowed will be used to finance fire fighting on public lands for the last half of the fiscal year.

BUREAU OF MINES

Health and safety.—A total of \$475,000 was requested for enforcement of Public Law 552 of the 82d Congress. An appropriation of \$266,000 is recommended, a reduction of \$209,000 in the estimate. The new law provides for the immediate closing of coal mines when certain hazardous conditions exist or when operators refuse to eliminate other hazards of less severity. It clearly imposes a heavier workload on the Bureau, which has been handled to date only by reducing the frequency of inspections and the number of mines inspected.

The requested funds were for the purpose of building up the staff to handle the added workload and were proposed to be obligated during the last two and a half months of this year. The committee is fully aware of the urgency of adequate safety enforcement in this activity where lives are too often snuffed out, but is convinced that additional experience with the new workload is necessary before accurate staffing needs can be projected. The amount allowed should be adequate to finish out the current year, and is to be used for employment of 50 additional coal mine inspectors, 12 mining engineers, and 11 electrical engineers and inspectors.

Funds for additional supporting clerical and laboratory personnel were requested but have not been allowed. The added workload to have been handled by this personnel is to be absorbed. Funds requested for other expenses have been reduced in proportion to the reduction in personnel recommended by the committee.

COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Salaries and Expenses.—The budget request of \$20,000 has been allowed to finance the Boards' activities for the last two and one-half months of this fiscal year. Establishment of the Board was required by the new coal mine inspection law, Public Law 552 of the 82d Congress. Its operations have been financed so far this year by money from the President's emergency funds.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with estimates |
|----------------|--|------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| | DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR | | | |
| | OFFICE OF SECRETARY | | | |
| 62 | Research in the utilization of saline water----- | \$275, 000 | \$50, 000 | — \$225, 000 |
| | BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT | | | |
| 62 | Management of lands and resources----- | 100, 000 | 60, 000 | — 40, 000 |
| | BUREAU OF MINES | | | |
| 62 | Health and safety----- | 475, 000 | 266, 000 | — 209, 000 |
| | Total, Department of Interior----- | 850, 000 | 376, 000 | — 474, 000 |
| | FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses----- | 20, 000 | 20, 000 | ----- |
| | Total, Chapter V----- | 870, 000 | 396, 000 | — 474, 000 |

CHAPTER VI

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN PHILLIPS, California, *Chairman*

NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

CHARLES R. JONAS, North Carolina

OTTO KRUEGER, North Dakota

ALBERT THOMAS, Texas

GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama

SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The committee considered a supplemental estimate of \$1,000,000 for the investigation of United States citizens employed on the staffs of any international organization. The plan calls for the investigation of "locally-recruited" staffs by the Civil Service Commission and "internationally recruited" staffs by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The committee is in accord with the purpose of the estimate and has provided the funds requested for carrying out the provisions of the Executive Order directing such investigations, but has required that such funds shall be obtained by transfer from the appropriation to the Department of State for the fiscal year 1953 for Information and Educational Activities. Approval of the transfer of funds from the foregoing appropriation has been secured from the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

In connection with the estimate for an increase in the travel limitation for this activity to \$2,000,000, the committee ascertained that under the existing system of corporate bookkeeping presently maintained by TVA, the cost of travel for each major activity of the agency is charged as a part of the cost of such major program, but that all travel, including construction travel, is initially charged to the travel account. In the case of TVA, which does much of its construction and operating work with its own employees, a substantial sum of money is thus included in the travel account before being charged against the several major activities. While the committee has approved an overall increase in the present limitation to \$1,800,000 for the fiscal year 1953, it proposes to give most serious consideration to the inclusion of separate limitations on travel for the several major items comprising this limitation in connection with the 1954 bill.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATION, MEDICAL, HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY SERVICES

The bill contains \$10,000,000 for this purpose, which is a reduction of \$8,960,000 in the budget estimate. The committee has allowed the

full amount of the estimate of \$5,000,000 for operating expenses in connection with hospitals. In connection with this part of the estimate the committee specifically directs that the Administrator of Veterans Affairs take such immediate steps as may be essential to furnish adequate hospitalization for needy veterans in the Philadelphia area. The remaining \$5,000,000 is for purposes other than the medical program and is provided only for use in connection with the Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, and the Loan Guaranty programs, no part of which is allowed for expenses of travel. The recent "freeze" order on the appointment of new personnel will prevent the appointment of most personnel proposed in the original budget submission and has assisted the committee in effecting a substantial reduction in the nonmedical part of the estimate.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

The committee has allowed the sum of \$75,000,000 for the payment of readjustment benefits, which is a reduction of \$131,058,000 in the budget estimate. The committee was advised during hearings on the bill that no firm estimate was available as to the number of Korean veterans who would apply for benefits under this heading, and that such information could be furnished more accurately at the time of the hearings on the regular 1954 estimates. A reduction of \$80,640,000 was voluntarily recommended in a supplemental submission by the Veterans' Administration. The committee feels that the amount recommended is sufficient to carry forward the program until more accurate information as to the real needs can be determined.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with estimates |
|-------------|---|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| | EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT | | | |
| | The White House Office----- | ----- | \$25, 000 | +\$25, 000 |
| 62 | Emergency fund for the President (national defense)----- | \$350, 000 | 75, 000 | —275, 000 |
| 62 | Council of Economic Advisers----- | 75, 000 | ----- | —75, 000 |
| | INDEPENDENT OFFICES | | | |
| | CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION | | | |
| 66 | Investigations of United States citizens for employment by international organizations----- | 1, 000, 000 | (¹) | —1, 000, 000 |
| 62 | Tennessee Valley Authority----- | (²) | (³) | ----- |
| | VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION | | | |
| 62 | Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services----- | 18, 960, 000 | 10, 000, 000 | —8, 960, 000 |
| 62 | Compensation and pensions----- | 237, 573, 000 | 237, 573, 000 | ----- |
| 62 | Readjustment benefits----- | 206, 058, 000 | 75, 000, 000 | —131, 058, 000 |
| 62 | Servicemen's indemnities----- | 2, 500, 000 | 2, 000, 000 | —500, 000 |

¹ \$1,000,000 made available by transfer from the appropriation "International Information and Educational Activities, Department of State Appropriation Act, 1953."

² Increase in limitation on travel from \$1,648,275 to \$2,000,000.

³ Increase in limitation on travel from \$1,648,275 to \$1,800,000.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill—Con.

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with estimates |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| | INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued | | | |
| | VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—Continued | | | |
| 62 | Veterans' miscellaneous benefits----- | \$1,361,000 | \$1,361,000 | ----- |
| 62 | Grants to the Republic of the Philippines----- | 1,423,500 | 1,000,000 | -\$423,500 |
| | Total, Veterans' Administration----- | 467,875,500 | 326,934,000 | -140,941,500 |
| | HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY | | | |
| 62 | Office of the Administrator: Defense housing----- | 12,500,000 | (⁴) | -12,500,000 |
| 62 | Public Housing Administration----- | ⁵ (1,350,000) | (⁴) | (-1,350,000) |
| | Total, Chapter VI----- | 481,800,500 | 327,034,000 | -154,766,500 |

SUMMARY TABLE SHOWING TOTAL REDUCTION RESULTING FROM ACTION RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Reduction in Budget estimates----- | \$154,766,500 |
| Rescission of \$1,000,000 of the appropriation for "Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief," Veterans' Administration----- | 1,000,000 |
| Total reduction recommended----- | 155,766,500 |

⁴ Request withdrawn by letter from the agency on February 2, 1953.

⁵ Increase in limitation on nonadministrative expenses.

CHAPTER VII

CIVIL FUNCTIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE

GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

T. MILLET HAND, New Jersey

ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, Michigan

JOHN TABER, New York

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri

LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan

JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

The committee has allowed the requested increase of \$278,200 in the limitation on general and administrative expenses of the Company in the amount of \$255,200. The reduction has been achieved by denying funds for ten additional positions in the Personnel Bureau.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of the amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with estimates |
|----------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | CIVIL FUNCTIONS | | | |
| | DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY | | | |
| 62 | Canal Zone Government----- | (¹) | (¹) | |
| 62 | Panama Canal Company----- | ² (\$278, 200) | ² (\$255, 200) | ----- (-\$23, 000) |

¹ Special language provision.

² Increase in administrative expense limitation.

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SUBCOMMITTEE

RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas
GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Michigan
EDWARD T. MILLER, Maryland
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, New York
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska

GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas
HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California
ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida

Supplemental estimates for the Department of Defense considered by the committee total \$1,200,000,000. The committee is advised that this amount was determined by deducting from the calculated supplemental gross requirements of \$1,444,377,246, savings and authorized transfers from certain appropriations in the total amount of \$244,377,246.

Of the total gross requirements of \$1,444,377,246 the amount of \$1,292,291,246 is attributable to four Acts of the Congress signed into law either during or subsequent to the consideration by the Congress of the regular estimates for fiscal year 1953.

With respect to the total estimate of \$1,200,000,000, it was developed during the hearings that additional offsets resulting from reduced requirements and transfers could be applied in the total amount of \$145,150,000, leaving for further consideration of the committee the amount of \$1,054,850,000.

The committee, at its request, received from the Department statements, by appropriation, of actual and projected obligations and anticipated unobligated balances as of June 30, 1953 for each of the Services. A review of these statements disclosed total anticipated unobligated balances at the end of the current fiscal year of some \$3.8 billions, including balances of public works and hard goods procurement appropriations. The committee feels that no question could possibly arise in applying to the budgeted request such unobligated balances as principally relate to maintenance and operational type activities. Accordingly, the Department is directed to so apply the amount of \$317,556,000.

On February 3, 1953 the Director of the Bureau of the Budget transmitted to each executive agency of the Government a directive which, in part, reads as follows:

Permit no increases over the January rate of obligations except on complete justification and specific approval, unless such increases are clearly necessary to meet requirements fixed by law.

In consonance with the provisions of this directive, the committee, in general again limiting its action to operational and maintenance activities, feels that the amount of \$155,585,000 can and should be realized from this source during the month of February. While the directive applies to the remaining months of the current fiscal year,

only the projected rate of February obligations were taken into account, since it is extremely improbable that significant increases over the January rate can be presented and justified before the end of February.

The third source of offsetting funds is contained in three items of appropriation currently available, namely: Maintenance and Operations, Army; Expansion of Production Facilities, Army; and unobligated funds reserved by the Air Force for fiscal year 1954.

The present rate of obligations under Maintenance and Operations, Army, based on a straight projection of actual obligations during the first six months, are estimated at \$3,888,444,000 on an annual basis. This is approximately \$1 billion less than the amount currently available for obligation. The committee is fully cognizant of requirements for winter clothing for Korea and certain spare parts which must be provided for during the remainder of the fiscal year, but, nonetheless, feels that the application of \$200,000,000 to the pay appropriation will still leave sufficient funds to provide for all such necessary items.

With respect to the item, Expansion of Production Facilities, information furnished the committee points to somewhat unrealistic obligation estimates for the months of May and June. The effected reduction of \$75,000,000 still leaves funds sufficient to more than double during each of these 2 months the rate of obligation projected for any preceding month.

An additional offsetting amount of \$295,583,000 is derived from anticipated unobligated funds reserved by the Air Force for obligation during fiscal year 1954. The withdrawal of this amount together with a prior adjustment by the Air Force will still leave in reserve the amount of \$351,327,000.

It should be pointed out that informal discussions of the committee with officials of the Department of Defense resulted in general agreement that this total budgeted request could in all probability be absorbed out of current funds. Some slight differences as to sources of needed transfers did, however, arise. The committee requests that any adjustments in the recommended transfers as may be absolutely necessary be cleared with the committee before they are made effective.

The additional amount of \$11,126,000 requested by the Army for station allowance costs under the Joint Travel Regulations is disallowed. The committee was not satisfied with the basis of the justification made for the item; it is planned to review the subject in more detail during hearings on the 1954 estimates.

The data discussed above is reflected in more detail by appropriation items in the following tabulation:

Department of Defense supplementals, 1953

[In thousands]

| Agency and item | Adjusted net request for appropriations | | Proposed committee transfers to meet net adjusted request | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| | H. Doc. 62 | Subsequent revisions and reductions | Net adjusted requirements | Savings based on scheduled obligations | Freeze order reductions | Other transfers |
| Office of the Secretary: | | | | | | |
| Claims----- | \$1, 000 | \$1, 000 | | | | |
| Retired pay----- | 25, 000 | 25, 000 | | | | |
| Total, Office of the Secretary----- | 26, 000 | 26, 000 | | | | |
| Department of the Army: | | | | | | |
| Military personnel----- | 776, 300 | 39, 450 | \$736, 850 | \$1, 500 | | \$1, 500 |
| Civilian relief in Korea----- | 11, 700 | 11, 700 | | 28, 750 | | 28, 750 |
| Maintenance and operations----- | | | | 50, 000 | \$51, 293 | 301, 293 |
| Reserve personnel requirements, 1953----- | | | | 3, 057 | | 3, 057 |
| Reserve personnel requirements, 1952-53----- | | | | 8, 541 | | 8, 541 |
| Expansion of production facilities----- | | | | | 12, 000 | 87, 000 |
| Funds reserved by Air Force----- | | | | | | 295, 583 |
| Total, Department of the Army----- | 788, 000 | 51, 150 | 736, 850 | 91, 848 | 63, 293 | 725, 724 |

Department of Defense supplementals, 1953—Continued

[In thousands]

| Agency and item | Adjusted net request for appropriations | | | Proposed committee transfers to meet net adjusted request | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| | H. Doc. 62 | Subsequent revisions and reductions | Net adjusted requirements | Savings based on scheduled obligations | Freeze order reductions | Other transfers | Total proposed transfers |
| Department of the Navy: | | | | | | | |
| Military personnel, Navy----- | \$140, 000 | ----- | \$140, 000 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Military personnel, Marine Corps----- | 63, 000 | ----- | 63, 000 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Navy personnel, general expenses----- | | | | \$1, 850 | ----- | ----- | \$1, 850 |
| Marine Corps, troops and facilities----- | | | | 40, 234 | ----- | ----- | 40, 234 |
| Ships and facilities----- | | | | 71, 439 | \$11, 748 | ----- | 83, 187 |
| Aircraft and facilities----- | | | | ----- | 4, 921 | ----- | 4, 921 |
| Ordnance and facilities----- | | | | 49, 202 | 8, 086 | ----- | 57, 288 |
| Medical care----- | | | | 5, 763 | ----- | ----- | 5, 763 |
| Civil engineering----- | | | | 5, 722 | ----- | ----- | 5, 722 |
| Service-wide operations----- | | | | 2, 407 | ----- | ----- | 2, 407 |
| Officer candidate program, 1952-53----- | | | | 852 | ----- | ----- | 852 |
| Officer candidate program, 1953-54----- | | | | 776 | ----- | ----- | 776 |
| Total, Department of the Navy----- | 203, 000 | ----- | 203, 000 | 178, 245 | 24, 755 | ----- | 203, 000 |

Department of the Air Force:

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|----------|-------------|
| Military personnel requirements----- | 183, 000 | 68, 000 | 115, 000 | | | |
| Maintenance and operations----- | | | | 47, 463 | 67, 537 | |
| Total, Department of the Air Force----- | 183, 000 | 68, 000 | 115, 000 | 47, 463 | 67, 537 | 115, 000 |
| Grand total, Department of Defense----- | 1, 200, 000 | 145, 150 | 1, 054, 850 | 317, 556 | 155, 585 | 1, 043, 724 |

¹ The difference of \$11,126,000 between this amount of \$1,043,724,000 and the net adjusted requirements of \$1,054,850,000 represents deletion by the committee of additional funds requested by the Army for station allowances.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in bill | Bill compared with estimates |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| 62 | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE | | | |
| | MILITARY FUNCTIONS | | | |
| | Office of the Secretary of Defense: | | | |
| | Claims..... | \$1, 000, 000 | ----- | —\$1, 000, 000 |
| | Retired pay..... | 25, 000, 000 | ----- | —25, 000, 000 |
| | Department of the Army: | | | |
| | Military personnel, Army..... | 776, 300, 000 | ----- | —776, 300, 000 |
| | Civilian relief in Korea..... | 11, 700, 000 | ----- | —11, 700, 000 |
| | Department of the Navy: | | | |
| | Military personnel, Navy..... | 140, 000, 000 | ----- | —140, 000, 000 |
| | Military personnel, Marine Corps..... | 63, 000, 000 | ----- | —63, 000, 000 |
| | Department of the Air Force: | | | |
| | Military personnel requirements..... | 183, 000, 000 | ----- | —183, 000, 000 |
| | Total, Chapter VIII..... | 1, 200, 000, 000 | (1) | —1, 200, 000, 000 |

¹ Language is included in the bill to permit transfers from currently available funds to the extent necessary to meet net adjusted requirements as explained elsewhere in this chapter of the report.

Union Calendar No. 9

83^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3053

[Report No. 46]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 16, 1953

Mr. TABER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply sup-
5 plemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,
6 1953, and for other purposes, namely:

1 CHAPTER I
2 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
3 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

4 For payment to Ona Stigler, widow of William G.
5 Stigler, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma,
6 \$12,500.

7 For payment to Mae Ruth Sabath, widow of Adolph
8 J. Sabath, late a Representative from the State of Illinois,
9 \$12,500.

10 For payment to Grace Hill Cox, widow of Eugene E.
11 Cox, late a Representative from the State of Georgia,
12 \$12,500.

13 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

14 Furniture: For an additional amount for "Furniture",
15 \$58,750, to remain available until June 30, 1954, and the
16 unexpended balance of the appropriation, "Contingent ex-
17 penses, House of Representatives, furniture, 1952", is hereby
18 made available until June 30, 1954.

19 Special and select committees: For an additional amount
20 for salaries and expenses of special and select committees
21 authorized by the House, \$500,000.

22 Stationery (revolving fund) : For an additional amount
23 for "Stationery (revolving fund)", for the first session of the
24 Eighty-third Congress, \$800, to remain available until
25 expended.

1 Automobiles for majority and minority leaders: Funds
 2 appropriated for "Contingent expenses of the House" are
 3 hereby made available for purchase, exchange, driving,
 4 maintenance, repair, and operation of two automobiles, one
 5 for the majority leader of the House, and one for the minority
 6 leader of the House.

7 EDUCATION OF SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

8 For an additional amount for Education of Senate, House,
 9 and Supreme Court pages, \$2,570.

10 THE JUDICIARY

11 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

12 FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

13 For an additional amount for "Fees of commissioners",
 14 \$107,000.

15 FEES OF JURORS

16 For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors", \$200,000.

17 MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

18 For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous salaries",
 19 \$20,600.

20 SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

21 For an additional amount for "Salaries of court re-
 22 porters", \$15,700.

23 SALARIES OF REFEREES

24 For an additional amount for "Salaries of referees",
 25 \$134,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall be avail-

1 able for payment of the salaries of referees at the increased
2 rates authorized by the Judicial Conference of the United
3 States in September 1952, effective as of October 1, 1952.

4 CHAPTER II

5 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

6 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,
7 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

8 CONSTRUCTION

9 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$2,500,-
10 000, to remain available until expended.

11 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

12 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

13 ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR-NAVIGATION FACILITIES

14 For an additional amount for "Establishment of air-
15 navigation facilities", \$2,500,000, to remain available until
16 expended.

17 FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

18 For an additional amount for "Federal-aid airport pro-
19 gram, Federal Airport Act", for liquidation of obligations
20 incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head
21 to enter into contracts, \$3,500,000, to remain available until
22 June 30, 1955.

PATENT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
\$100,000.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

For an additional amount for "Federal-aid highways", to
remain available until expended, \$185,000,000, which sum
is composed of \$72,500,000, the remainder of the amount
authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, and
\$112,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appro-
priated for the fiscal year 1952.

ACCESS ROADS (ACT OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1950)

For an additional amount for "Access roads (Act of
September 7, 1950)" for liquidation of obligations incurred
pursuant to the contract authority granted by the Act of
October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422), \$8,000,000, to remain
available until expended.

CHAPTER III

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the
public debt", \$750,000.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

CHAPTER IV

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration", \$6,750,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available for expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684).

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS

For payments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$27,200,000, to remain available until June 30, 1954.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$150,000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Economic Stabilization Agency, 1953" and \$50,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses,

Mexican Farm Labor Program, 1953", to remain available until July 31, 1953: *Provided*, That these funds shall be utilized solely for the continuation through June 1953 of a consumer price index upon the same basis employed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in compiling such an index for the period prior to January 1, 1953.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND

SURVIVORS INSURANCE

The amount authorized by the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1953, to be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance", is increased from "\$60,500,000" to "\$62,500,000".

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance", \$340,000,000.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RESEARCH IN THE UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

For an additional amount for "Research in the utilization of saline water", \$50,000.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", \$60,000.

BUREAU OF MINES

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Health and safety", \$266,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available for the purchase of fifty passenger motor vehicles in addition to those heretofore provided.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF
REVIEW

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$20,000.

CHAPTER VI

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, \$25,000.

1 EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

2 NATIONAL DEFENSE

3 For an additional amount for "Emergency fund for the
4 President, national defense", \$75,000.

5 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

6 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

7 INVESTIGATIONS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOY-
8 MENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

9 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
10 Executive Order No. 10422, approved January 9, 1953,
11 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secre-
12 tary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads
13 of other international organizations, certain information con-
14 cerning United States citizens employed, or being considered
15 for employment by such organizations, \$1,000,000, to be
16 derived by transfer from the appropriation for "International
17 Information and Educational Activities", Department of
18 State Appropriation Act, 1953: *Provided*, That this ap-
19 propriation may be apportioned for use pursuant to Section
20 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, prior to April 1,
21 1953: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be
22 available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable
23 appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission
24 and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses in-
25 curred by such agencies under said Executive order.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, as amended by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, on the amount available for expenses of travel, is hereby increased from “\$1,648,275” to “\$1,800,000”.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATION, MEDICAL, HOSPITAL, AND DOMICILIARY SERVICES

For an additional amount for “Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services”, \$10,000,000.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for “Compensation and pensions”, \$237,573,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for “Readjustment benefits”, \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITIES

For an additional amount for “Servicemen's indemnities”, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS' MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS

For an additional amount for “Veterans' miscellaneous benefits”, \$1,361,000, to remain available until expended.

1 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

2 For an additional amount for "Grants to the Republic of
3 the Philippines", \$1,000,000.

4 REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

5 SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF

6 The appropriation heretofore granted for "Soldiers' and
7 sailors' civil relief" is hereby reduced by the sum of \$1,000,-
8 000, and said amount shall be carried to the surplus of the
9 Treasury.

10 CHAPTER VII

11 CIVIL FUNCTIONS

12 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

13 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

14 Not to exceed \$15,000 of the amount appropriated
15 under this head in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act,
16 1953, for construction and major equipment, shall be avail-
17 able for payment to the Republic of Panama for an ex-
18 pansion of its Colon sewerage disposal facilities to serve the
19 Canal Zone.

20 PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

21 The amount made available under this head in the
22 Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953, for general and
23 administrative expenses of the Panama Canal Company, is
24 hereby increased from "\$3,301,800" to "\$3,557,000".

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY FUNCTIONS

For additional amounts for the following appropriations of not to exceed the amounts stated:

“Claims”, Department of Defense, \$1,000,000;

“Retired pay”, Department of Defense, \$25,000,000;

“Military personnel, Army”, \$725,724,000;

“Military personnel, Navy”, \$140,000,000;

“Military personnel, Marine Corps”, \$63,000,000;

“Military personnel requirements”, Department of the Air Force, \$115,000,000; the foregoing amounts under this heading to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation during the fiscal year 1953 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

The unexpended balance of the appropriation “Marine Corps troops and facilities, 1951” shall remain available during the fiscal year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder for procurement of ordnance, ammunition, and other military equipment.

SHIPS AND FACILITIES

The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Ships and facilities, 1951" shall remain available during the fiscal year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder for procurement of electronics equipment.

ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Ordnance and facilities, 1951" shall remain available during the fiscal year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder for (1) production and procurement of Navy ordnance and ammunition and (2) procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

Of the appropriation granted under this head in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, \$1,685,044,000 shall be used to complete the liquidation of all obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted under this head to enter into contracts.

CHAPTER IX

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the

1 salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike
2 against the Government of the United States or who is a
3 member of an organization of Government employees that
4 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
5 United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an or-
6 ganization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
7 of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for
8 the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima
9 facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not
10 contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike
11 against the Government of the United States, is not a member
12 of an organization of Government employees that asserts the
13 right to strike against the Government of the United States,
14 or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
15 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
16 Government of the United States by force or violence: *Pro-*
17 *vided further*, That any person who engages in a strike
18 against the Government of the United States or who is a
19 member of an organization of Government employees that
20 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
21 United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an
22 organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Govern-
23 ment of the United States by force or violence and accepts
24 employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any
25 appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall

1 be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not
2 more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year,
3 or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause
4 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
5 provisions of existing law.

6 SEC. 902. This Act may be cited as the "Second Sup-
7 plemental Appropriation Act, 1953".

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3053

[Report No. 46]

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for
other purposes.

By Mr. TABER

FEBRUARY 16, 1953

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued Feb. 19, 1953

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

For actions of Feb. 18, 1953

33rd-1st, No. 27

CONTENTS

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Adjournment.....6 | F.H.A.....1 | Purchasing.....37 |
| Appropriations.....7,36 | Forestry.....9,21 | Reclamation.....13,19 |
| Budgeting.....17 | Fruits and vegetables.....2 | Report.....11 |
| Buildings.....25 | Health.....16 | Research.....14 |
| Conservation.....34 | Holiday.....28 | Rubber.....11 |
| Consumers.....29 | Inflation.....24 | St. Lawrence water- |
| Cooperatives.....3,18 | Meats.....2 | way.....5,18,32 |
| Dairy products.....2 | Oleomargarine.....4 | Tariff.....15 |
| Disaster relief.....26 | Organization.....22 | Taxation.....3,8,27 |
| Education.....7 | Prices, bread.....10 | T.V.A.....35 |
| Electrification.....18,35 | control.....7 | Trade, foreign.....30 |
| Expenditures.....31 | parity.....23 | Veterans' benefits...20,33 |
| Farm-program study.....2 | support.....1 | Wildlife.....21 |
| Farm training.....20,33 | | |

HIGHLIGHTS: Senators debated Secretary's price-support policies. Sen. Agriculture Committee announced farm-program study. Sen. Humphrey spoke against additional taxation of cooperatives, and introduced and discussed bill to tighten budget procedures. H. committee reported tax-reduction bill. House debated supplemental appropriation bill. Rep. Multer introduced and discussed bill for stand-by controls.

SENATE

1. **PRICE SUPPORTS.** Sen. Fulbright, Humphrey, and Johnson of Tex. criticized the Secretary's recent speech on this subject, and Sens. Taft, Watkins, Bennett, and Williams defended the Secretary (pp. 1227-41).

Sen. Humphrey inserted a Hubbard County Mutual Fire Insurance Co., Minn., resolution favoring full parity and additional Farmers' Home Administration appropriations (p. 1193). He also inserted a Rochester Dairy Cooperative, Minn., telegram favoring supports of dairy products at the same level as basic commodities (p. 1195).

2. **FARM-PROGRAM STUDY.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee announced its future program as follows:

"(1) That hearings are planned with regard to CCC grain sales, the date of which is as yet undetermined;

"(2) That the low market prices of recently imported New Zealand beef would be investigated in the near future;

"(3) Agreement to ask the Secretary of Agriculture to appear before the committee to present any legislation that his department has prepared; and

"(4) That the committee staff will investigate and prepare a study in connection with stabilizing the market for perishable commodities, specifically for the following three categories -- (a) dairy products, (b) meats, and (c) fruits and vegetables." (p. D75).

3. **TAXATION.** Sen. Humphrey spoke against additional taxes on cooperatives and inserted an article by Jerry Voorhis taking the same position (pp. 1216-18).

4. **OLEOMARGARINE.** Sen. Wiley criticized mis-labeling of this product and inserted a Wis. Guernsey Breeders' Assn. resolution on the matter (p. 1193).

5. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Sen. Humphrey inserted a Hubbard County Farm Bureau resolution favoring this project (p. 1193).

6. ADJOURNED until Fri., Feb. 20 (p. 1241).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

7. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Concluded all general debate on this bill, H. R. 3053, and deferred further consideration until Thurs. after reading the section covering the Legislative Branch (pp. 1245-64). Rep. Smith, Va., inserted a tabulation showing exact or estimated obligations during the 1950 fiscal year for education in various agencies, including Agriculture (p. 1247). Rep. Multer discussed his bill, H. R. 3184, a standby control bill which would authorize the President to issue a freeze order on prices, rents, and wages for a 90-day period (pp. 1260-1).

8. TAX REDUCTION. The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 1, to cut individual income taxes about 10% beginning July 1, 1953 (H. Rept. 49) (p. 1275).

9. FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 1816, to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain (H. Rept. 75). (p. 1275).

10. BREAD PRICES. Rep. Fine inserted a constituent's letter claiming that bread prices increased immediately following the recent decontrol order on bread (p. 1243).

Rep. Miller, Nebr., claimed that increases in processing, handling, and labor costs have caused the increase in bread prices, and that the market price of wheat has been declining for several months (p. 1244).

11. RUBBER. Rep. Shafer spoke in favor of selling the Government-owned synthetic rubber facilities to private industry at their fair market value and stated he would introduce legislation toward this end (pp. 1268-71).

12. REPORT. Received the FTC's annual report (p. 1275).

13. RECLAMATION. Received a Montana State Legislature memorial urging the President and Congress to safeguard the economy and livelihood of the people in selecting the site for the proposed Libby Dam, etc. (p. 1278).

BILLS INTRODUCED

14. RESEARCH. S. 977, by Sen. Smith and Sen. Aiken, to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee (p. 1196).

15. TARIFF. S. 983, by Sen. Butler and H. R. 3162, by Rep. Curtis, to carry out the recommendations of the U. S. Tariff Commission with respect to duty concessions on Swiss watch movements; to Ways and Means Committee (pp. 1196, 1276).

16. HEALTH. S. 994, by Sen. Saltonstall and others, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and maintenance of local public health units; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee (p. 1196).

H. R. 3182, by Rep. Miller, to establish a Department of Public Health and Welfare in accordance with recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to Government Operations Committee (p. 1276).

I would like to say that often we talk about civil rights and the need for preserving and fighting for them without realizing that it is in these areas of effective and just police protection where much can be done to make civil rights live and vital.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

(Mr. BAKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, two-thirds of Tennessee's 42,246 square miles is devoted to cultivation, pasture, and woodland, and about 38 percent of our total working force is engaged in farming. But Tennessee leads the South in the production of minerals, her extensive resources including coal, phosphate stone, clay, sand and gravel, zinc, marble, and manganese.

From the standpoint of the country as a whole, coal output in Tennessee may not appear to be significant. Our mines produced about 4 million tons in 1952 as compared with a national total of 465 million tons. On close examination, however, we find that Tennessee's bituminous coal industry is actually a very vital part of the State and national economy, and that it is expected to become progressively more important in the years ahead.

Some 6,000 miners are employed by the bituminous coal industry in the great State of Tennessee. Our coal belt extends from the north to the south borders over a width of about 60 miles, and the 17 counties in which coal is mined at the present time comprise almost half a million persons. Thus we have 25,000 men, women, and children in Tennessee obtaining their subsistence directly from coal, with the livelihood of many of the remaining residents of the coal area largely dependent upon this commodity.

Tennessee is a TVA State in which hydro constitutes 46 percent of the total energy produced, but coal still contributes 54 percent, and its share will increase in the future. When plants now under construction are completed more than 17 million tons of coal will be required annually to supply the steam plants in the TVA system. Since Tennessee is the home of Oak Ridge, it is also relevant to point out that projects under construction or planned by the Atomic Energy Commission during 1952 will use an annual total of about 23 million tons of coal, much of which will come from mines in Tennessee.

When these facts are brought to notice, coal's place in the overall energy perspective becomes quite apparent. No further evidence is needed to emphasize the necessity of keeping the coal industry in superior condition as it girds for the increasing service expected of it in future years.

Why then should this Congress stand by and accept the continuance of a state of affairs in which the coal industry in Tennessee and elsewhere is being materially weakened and its working force threatened with unemployment? I

speak of the unfair competition that has come to coal's markets in the form of foreign residual oil, a produce for which we have absolutely no need at the present time and on which we would certainly not wish to rely for future supply.

Foreign residual oil has no place in our economic plan. We do not need it now and we shall never need it. Tennessee alone has 12½ billion tons of recoverable coal reserves, and that is less than 2 percent of our national total. There is enough mineable coal in this land of ours to last for more than 1,000 years, and every fuel authority will tell you that a growing portion of our energy needs will have to come from those vast reserves.

To permit the unnecessary debilitation of our coal industry at this time is not only an imprudent policy, it is a dangerous policy. It is unfair to the people of every other State as well as to the people of Tennessee and the other coal-producing districts.

Let this Congress wait no longer to remedy this situation. We must drastically curtail residual oil imports, and we must do it at once so that the coal industry can ready itself for the gigantic tasks that are on the horizon.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on this February 18, freemen everywhere should pause and give thought to the fact that 32 years ago the people of Armenia declared their independence. Today that independence exists only in the spirit of Armenians, who continue to hope to be able to regain their liberties.

We should look to Armenia today, as an example of what happens to freemen under communism and resolve that it must never happen here and that we will do all within our power to restore liberty to the enslaved Armenians as well as to the enslaved, no matter where they may be.

Let us stand together as freemen, fighting to guarantee liberty and freedom to all throughout the world.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree thoroughly with everything my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has said.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 144 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any

provision contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 3053, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The rule waives points of order. The reason for the waiving of points of order is that there has been a transfer of appropriations from one agency to another. By that I mean there is a balance in some of the agencies, and the Committee on Appropriations, I believe, has acted properly in using up the gigantic balances which now exist in some of the agencies. Outside of that, Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. In other words, amendments may be offered. The rule provides for 3 hours of general debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 13 minutes. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules unanimously reported this rule. I believe there is no question about the rule itself. However, the bill which the rule makes in order brings up for the first time questions of appropriations that are going to be made by this Congress in this session. This is a supplemental appropriation bill. Supplemental appropriation bills, from my observation, have been largely made up of things that the bureaus and the departments think of after the Congress has appropriated the amount of money we think they ought to use in that year. The biggest task before this Congress is going to be to balance the budget. It is not going to be an easy task, but it is a very important task if we are to restore this country's fiscal affairs to an even balance. It is going to be a task where all of us are going to have to make some personal sacrifices. We are not going to do this job by saying, "It is all right to cut the other fellow, but you must not cut anything that is coming for my State or my district." That is the tendency. It is very strong. That temptation is very strong, and I know it because I have undergone it myself. Neither is this responsibility to balance the budget a party responsibility. I regard it as a responsibility of every Member of the House because this country in the last election voted for fiscal sanity. This country is demanding a balanced and a business budget. As I say, it is going to be a difficult task. It is going to be particularly difficult at this time for the Committee on Appropriations, and as I have observed the Committee on Appropriations, in my opinion, means to do a job this

time and they are going to need the help of the Members of Congress.

At the beginning of the consideration of appropriation bills I wish to align myself with those Members of the House, including members of the Appropriations Committee, who feel that there is a serious "must" to balance the budget and to cut down all appropriations that can be cut down. In order to do that we have got to cut everywhere. I do not believe there is an area in the executive departments of the Government that cannot, without damaging efficient operation, cut their budget to some extent if there is a will to do it. The trouble I have found is that there is not any will to do it in the executive departments. They come here for supplemental appropriations. Even after the Congress has debated the matter and decided on the appropriation they should have for that year, they come up and ask for deficiency appropriations. We will never get anywhere unless we make up our minds that we are going to cut, even if it hurts us, and that we are going to stand by the Appropriations Committee.

I think it is very clear that this desire to balance the budget and to bring our economy into a businesslike pattern is not exclusively the property of the Republican Party. I think the members of the Appropriations Committee on the Democratic side are equally concerned about this situation, and realize as fully as do the Republicans that we are rapidly approaching the point where we will have reached the maximum of borrowing capacity authorized by the Congress. It will be a bad thing for this country if we have to come in here with another bill to raise the debt limit above the present \$275 billion. I can remember in years gone by when it was seriously debated on this floor as to whether this country could stand a public debt of \$50 billion, and then we debated whether we could stand one of \$75 billion. Now we have reached the point of two hundred and seventy-five billion. This is a serious proposition. What are we going to do about it as a practical matter? I do not think the way to do it is to start out reducing taxes, until you know how much money you are going to spend. There used to be an old saying in the country that you must not put the cart before the horse. It looks to me like my Republican friends have started out by putting the fiscal cart before the Republican elephant. I hope they are going to think better of that, because this is a serious proposition.

If the people of America are endowed with one thing it is commonsense, and they know perfectly well, as a sensible proposition, that before you are going to balance the budget you have to reduce expenditures, and you cannot balance the budget by reducing taxes and leaving the expenditures where they are. That is perfectly obvious. Of course, we hear a great deal of talk about this being a businessman's Government. I do not take much stock in that. I think it is a pretty good thing to have a businessman's Government. When you stop and remember that this country is the biggest business on earth now, or ever

has been, what is wrong with having a few men who are trained in business to tell us what to do? We need a few of the other kind, but let us back up these businessmen, and let us think along business lines and see what we can do about this thing which I regard the most serious thing before this country; namely, putting this country on a sound fiscal basis. In order to do so everybody will have to stand up and be counted.

That brings me to a rather delicate subject, as far as I am concerned. That is the movement that will take place under this bill to restore an item of \$24 million for aid to public schools in impacted areas. I supported the bill authorizing that, and I regard it as a just obligation on the part of the Government that where we start a large Government operation in a small community, and as a result of that there is a great influx of people, it becomes necessary to have schools, and the Government owes a certain obligation to supplement what the communities can raise.

I agree with that principle, and I voted for it; and this year after the Appropriations Committee had considered it and after the Congress had considered it, it was decided that \$40 million was the amount that should be appropriated for that purpose and we did appropriate it. Now we are confronted with a request for \$24 million more.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has got to decide how to cut this cloth to fit the garment; we cannot permit the agencies of Government to decide those things. My State gets a good deal of money out of that appropriation, and we like to have it, and I want to have a just proportion of what is appropriated. But, after all, we have a great many things to do, a great many things to make appropriations for. We made a \$40 million appropriation for this purpose. It was done under a formula provided by Congress which was interpreted by the Office of Education. If that interpretation is wrong then we ought to cut this amount proportionately.

I just cannot see our balancing this budget, which I regard as the most important thing for this Congress to do, if we are going to yield every time an additional appropriation is requested for something that affects our own district or our own State. I do not like to say that; it sort of hurts to say it, particularly when it gets back home that I have said it; but we have got to straighten this thing out. And let me tell you something; we will be doing a greater favor to our people, and we will be doing a greater favor to our children and their children if we put this Government on a sound basis even if we do have to say "No" once in a while to our own constituents.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TABER. With reference to the school item, I wish to call attention to the fact that out of an appropriation of \$40,000,000, \$5,715,000 was obligated to the 31st of December. Twice that

would be just about \$12,000,000. Frankly, with that picture there were many who did not feel that any further appropriation for a deficiency was justified.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Speaking of education, I was rather astonished yesterday in the Rules Committee when the Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor informed us that this Government was spending for public education—had spent in 1951, they did not have more recent figures—the appalling amount of \$3,618,000,000; and of that sum only \$79,000,000 was being expended under the supervision of the Office of Education.

Somebody said that did not mean anything, that \$2,941,000 of that amount—all except about \$600,000,000—was being spent by the Veterans' Administration.

I want to say while I am on my feet that if we are going to do this job of balancing this budget, if we are serious about it and mean what we say, I do not think there is any department or any agency of this Government that is too sacred for the Appropriations Committee and this House to take a look at their budget and see if it can properly be cut, and then cut it accordingly.

Last year, as you will remember, there was a great deal of odor about this education matter in the Bureau of Veterans' Affairs, and that this Congress authorized a select committee to make an investigation. So I think we could well look at every appropriation that comes before us and see whether we can properly save without injuring the actual necessary functions of that department.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am for a sound fiscal policy, and all that, but I would like to know what this administration's position is on the budget. We have one budget before the Congress that has been kicked, cuffed around, and cussed, and I refer to the Truman budget. Does the gentleman not think it would be the wise thing and a thing that should be done for this administration to submit a budget to the Congress of the United States? If the gentleman himself is not prepared to speak on that, I trust that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] when he takes the floor will give us the benefit of his thinking on that point.

It seems to me that the present administration, this changed administration, after a budget has been submitted by President Truman, and when they have come into power, would send a budget to the Congress of the United States, which would be the right and proper thing for it to do.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that is a most timely suggestion. But for some unknown reason the present administration has never asked me about what it ought to do. I do not hesitate, however, to give gratuitous advice. It has not been listened to before and I do not expect it will be listened to at this time.

I would make several suggestions to my friends on the Republican side, and I know they are anxious to do this job as we are and I know most of them are striving to do it. One of the suggestions would be, as the distinguished minority leader stated, give us the budget figures so we will know what we are shooting at, so that we can help you do the things that are necessary to be done. Do not leave us with the Truman budget which you say is not any good. Let us have the Eisenhower budget so that we may know in what direction we are heading in order that we may give you the assistance needed today in the interest of the country at large.

I might make another suggestion. When you begin to talk about reducing taxes, let us put the old cart behind the horse instead of in front of him. Let us forget about the possibility of reducing taxes until we are in the position of saying to the country that we have reduced appropriations to the point where tax reduction is feasible. We are starting out in the wrong way. I give that advice to my Republican friends most seriously, and with a sincere purpose to be helpful.

I might add another piece of advice. Everyone talks about loopholes in the tax structure. I would like to know why our good friends have not started in to amend and to plug up some of the loopholes that will give us more revenue instead of reducing taxes to give us less revenue. I know many organizations and businesses that are in competition with other businesses, so does the Ways and Means Committee. They have considered this in past sessions. Why do you not shut off the loopholes and give us some more revenue that the country is entitled to and in that manner relieve the anxiety and burden upon the other taxpayers?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The point made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is well taken. Of course, we recognize that it takes time to formulate a long and complicated budget. But we should have it at the earliest possible moment and before we consider the individual bills. I make this point if I may. There have been 2 or 3 months to work on the problems. Today this Congress is entitled to know—to know now—whether or not the brand of the present administration is on the requests which were considered by the Appropriations Committee in the pending bill. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, but frankly I am not quite clear as to whether the present bill falls within or without the budget of the present administration.

Is the present administration asking us to appropriate the money requested by the budget in the estimates submitted to the committee? I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] can clarify that question and I hope he will in his own time this afternoon.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know the gentleman can and will.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, in connection with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BORDEN], I insert at this point, figures supplied by the Committee on Education and Labor, showing amounts expended by various agencies of the Government in the field of education:

Exact or estimated obligations for Federal educational programs, by agency, fiscal year 1950

[Subject to the limitations set forth in the preceding explanation]

| | |
|---|---------------|
| I. Executive departments: | |
| A. Department of State..... | \$21,593,693 |
| B. Department of Treasury..... | 3,731,926 |
| C. Department of Defense— | |
| Army | 147,445,605 |
| D. Department of Defense— | |
| Navy | 116,724,760 |
| E. Department of Defense— | |
| Air Force | 110,806,884 |
| F. Department of Justice..... | 1,186,416 |
| G. Post Office Department..... | 0 |
| H. Department of the Interior | 22,590,726 |
| I. Department of Agriculture | 177,083,596 |
| J. Department of Commerce | 9,114,382 |
| K. Department of Labor..... | 3,621,554 |
| II. Independent offices and agencies: | |
| A. Atomic Energy Commission | 25,762,454 |
| B. Federal Security Agency..... | 70,089,436 |
| C. Smithsonian Institution..... | 2,280,132 |
| D. Tennessee Valley Authority | 4,188,116 |
| E. Veterans' Administration | 2,941,218,541 |
| F. Other independent offices and agencies | 23,568,312 |
| III. The Executive Office, Legislative Establishment, and District of Columbia: | |
| A. The Executive Office of the President | 2155,146 |
| B. The Legislative Establishment | 8,403,788 |
| C. The District of Columbia | 29,074,172 |
| Total | 3,618,639,639 |

¹Excluding principally the entire Army service school system, for which adequate data for an estimate are not available.

²Excluding the Central Intelligence Agency, regarding which information is withheld for security reasons.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would not impose myself on you these 4 or 5 minutes were it not for the fact that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] mentioned the expenditures by the Federal Government in the field of education. I thought it was probably a good time to give the House a little information that they would be interested in. While I was chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor I borrowed what I regarded as one of the best research men from the Congressional Library and put him on the job of trying to find out where the Government departments were spending money in the field of education and, as best he could, for what purpose it was being spent. Well, it disclosed a tremendous

amount of money. I then set up a committee to go into some of the expenditures to see just what was taking place. If you will recall, the last few weeks of the last session were pretty jammed up with legislative work and the committee was handling some very important matters, matters which the House was anxious for the committee to turn loose to it, such as the mine inspection bill and some other matters. So, we did not get far with the investigation, but I did reach this very definite conclusion and that was that there should be some place in this Government where those departments who are spending money in the field of education, which includes virtually all of them, should file a report showing specifically the purposes for which it was being spent, the amount being spent, and by whom. Now, the only place I know for that is in the Office of Education. I have discussed it with the Commissioner of Education. I would not suggest that he have one particle of power over that report or the right to do anything with it other than assemble and send it to the Congress, and he has no desire whatever for any authority over the expenditures, the management, the direction, suggestions, or anything else. But, the Office of Education was set up for the purpose of gathering information and data on the educational progress and systems of this country, and then let it be there for those who would seek it. Thank goodness, he desires to stay out of the field of running or influencing the operation of schools, and has expressed this view many times on record.

Now, here was the picture that confronted me. Here was a congressional committee set up, and it took over a year and a half with the hardest kind of detail work and investigating to gather together from the thousands of different Government sources the desired information. So, I feel it would be perfectly proper if a resolution were introduced, and I frankly say to you that I propose to introduce it, or someone else could do it, that would direct the various departments of Government to file in the Office of the Commissioner of Education such a report and such a finding so that this Congress and the committees could have at all times available the information concerning the expenditures in the field of education. I think the expenditures have been extravagant, but I do not blame the Committee on Appropriations, because there is no practical way at present for them to find the facts. There has not been any way for anyone else to find out. So, I thought after my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] mentioned it, that the House would be interested in knowing that there has been some careful thought and study given to the solution of the rather complex problem that he brought to your attention, and I hope at some early date we will have an opportunity to designate a place for this information to be deposited so that the membership of the House as well as the rest of the United States can have available that information. Then they can see where mistakes were made, profit by

them, save money, and improve their operations in the future.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] I think it would be useful and informative to the House to have those figures which were given to you yesterday by the chairman of this committee, and I ask unanimous consent to insert with my remarks the amount of money spent by various departments for educational purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. I will say to the gentleman I think the report covers about three volumes. It was prepared by Mr. Quattlebaum of the Congressional Library, and they are now House documents and are available to you. I am sure the Committee on Education and Labor will be glad to furnish them to you. This will give you precise figures, if you desire them.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3053, with Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 16 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have here the first supplemental appropriation bill to be considered by this Congress. I call attention to page 2 of the report, where it appears that there were requests for \$2,313,719,590, of which the committee allowed in new funds \$904,672,920.

Frankly, we went over those estimates in our subcommittees just as carefully as it was possible to do. The big item involved was the military item, and there the request was for \$1,200,000,000. We were able to make reductions in that, part of them made by the committee and part of them made by the departments before that came to us, totaling \$157,256,276.

We were able to find funds where transfers can be made out of appropriations for the Department of Defense which will not be used, which are current 1953 appropriations, and which the responsible officials of the Department agreed could not be used, so that we were able to provide for all needs by authority to transfer given funds to the Department in sufficient amount to carry on the activities.

Those items of deficiency in the military estimates largely resulted from the

bills which were enacted in the last couple of days of the session, at times when it was absolutely impossible to properly provide for them, when the adjournment was expected on the 5th day of July. A provision was placed in the bill which was passed which permitted the Department of Defense to meet its obligations under those bills, but we were not in a position to provide separately for them nor to analyze carefully what would be required. So it was necessary that those estimates be submitted to us at this time. They result very largely from the adoption of discharge pay—an item, which I understand, the Committee on Armed Services refused to report.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to point out that that imposed an obligation of some \$600 million to make up the \$1,200,000,000, and the Committee on Armed Services did not report that bill to the House. It came out of the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. TABER. It came out in a conference report. The item was placed on it in the other body.

Mr. VINSON. I believe the gentleman is in error. That is combat pay.

Mr. TABER. Yes; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. The \$600 million came about in that way. The mustering-out item did not come before the committee, and, as a matter of fact, the Committee on Armed Services did not consider the combat-pay bill.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I will leave the other for the other members of the committee with the exception of one item which relates to the school situation. Down to the 31st of December, there had been obligated by the Educational Bureau and the Federal Security Agency—\$5,715,000.

They had an appropriation available to them of \$40 million which was made by the last Congress.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I am so reluctant to interrupt the gentleman. Generally, I like to regard myself as being one of those who wants to balance the budget, but in connection with the \$5,715,000 that have been obligated, I wonder if the gentleman realizes that under the wording of the law they cannot pay out the remaining money until this school year. It must be prorated if there is not enough to pay all entitlements 100 percent. The Administrator sees right now that there is not enough and so informed the subcommittee. Therefore, if he pays 100 percent to those who have established their entitlement now, he will soon run out of funds. Some will get 100 percent and some will get nothing. So the only sensible thing for him to do is just what he is doing, and that is to wait and prorate it, and if he does not have enough money to pay but one-half then he can pay them 50 percent of what they are entitled to. There is a strong probability that some of these

schools will simply be forced to close when the money runs out. Remember you are not playing Santa Claus to anybody. This money is an obligation of the Federal Government. The Federal Government created the conditions making it necessary to expand the school facilities, the Congress recognized this and wrote into law provisions enabling the Federal Government to take care of its own obligation.

Other impact areas have added since other establishments have been reactivated and put in operation. I really wanted the gentleman to have all of these facts. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] will agree with my point of view. I wish he were here right now, because we have discussed the matter and I would like to have him make his own statement.

Mr. TABER. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to what the facts are. We were presented with that kind of argument a year ago and a deficiency item was carried through. It resulted in a \$4 million unobligated balance which expired at the end of the year. I will tell the gentleman how the thing works, because I have been into it and I think I understand it pretty well.

School districts present their petitions to the Department of Education or the Bureau of Education, or whatever the exact name is. Those petitions are processed by that department. If they approve of them they set up as an obligation the amount for which they are processed. The number that was processed was 359 down to February 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The obligations to that date were \$3,750,000. There were 359 of those. There had been 141 districts down to the 11th of February—more than there had been in the year before. Why they would need to have any deficiency under any circumstance that would justify \$24 million is beyond any possible explanation. They should have come in here not now but later on in the session, if they were going to come in, and not at this time when it is absolutely impossible for them to see that any such amount as \$24 million additional would be justified.

There is a very serious question about the real entitlement of these people to so much money. The big item of money is not spent on those places where the children are on military reservations or other reservations of the Government or where their people are employed in connection therewith, but the big item is at places outside, where people live in Federal Housing projects, and where they reside with a parent employed on Federal property which is situated in such State.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. There may be some room for discussion as to the formula passed by Congress. Frankly, I am not

thoroughly satisfied with that myself, but it was a very difficult problem to deal with, and we tried to take care of it as best we could. Frankly, I do not believe this has been quite covered. While the \$5 million has been obligated, the entitlements, those that are entitled to it, according to the formula written into the law, have not been made and time for filing has not yet arrived. It is figured they will now get 60 percent, and some of these areas cannot run a school on a 60-percent grant. We have brought about the condition by putting the military people there, by putting the Government tax-free housing there, by dragging in the people and loading them on the community. That was thoroughly discussed at the time the bill was passed. I want to help save everything we can save within reason, but I do not believe the gentleman would want to cut the entitlement to 60 percent.

Mr. TABER. This is not for school construction, but for operation only. I have a situation in my own district which is just about as acute as any, and I know how this thing works. I am talking from the standpoint of a citizen of the United States, and trying to meet my responsibilities as a Member of Congress to balance this budget and try to get sense into it.

I cannot go along with the thought that they know what they are talking about in connection with this situation; I do not believe as they do; I do not believe they are in any position properly and honestly to present to us a reason for the increase in this appropriation of \$24 million. I have gone into it very thoroughly; I have appeared before these people in connection with allotments for my own district, so I know how the thing operates, and I do not believe that they have at this time any proper information on which to come before us with a deficiency appropriation. I do not believe they are entitled to it; otherwise I would come out here and support them.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. I rise at this time only to see if I can clarify certain things which probably need a little clarification.

The main difficulty with impact areas for school needs are in those sections where there has been a Federal impact. I think there is general agreement that we should aid such districts. They have never had the full amount they have needed or ought to have to fulfill the obligations which they felt should be met in the light of the bill which Congress passed. Knowing that they have always had to hold back in their apportionments. For instance, it was stated a moment ago that of the \$40 million only \$5 million had been used. The reason for that is because they are not sure of the amount of money they will receive. They can use a great deal more money; they could use this twenty-odd million dollars which has been cut out, use it very well if they are to meet all the entitlements throughout this country; but they are not sure of the amount they will receive, and it is incumbent on the Ad-

ministrator to appropriate on a pro-rata basis the amount of money he finally has. They could spend sixty-some-million dollars, which would be the \$35 million they have available plus the \$24 million, if that is the right figure, they ask for in the deficiency appropriation, use it by June 30 of this year. However, if they do not receive that and have only the \$35 million which is now available to them, it will have to be dealt out on a pro-rata basis, and the different district will have to be cut down. That is the reason they asked for this \$24 million additional. If they do not get it, then the grants will have to be cut down in all the districts.

Mr. TABER. I have this picture right in front of me as it was presented by them. They claim they anticipate 2,300 applications. Down to the 11th of February they had received 1,036, and we are better than seven-twelfths through the fiscal year. They claim they anticipate an additional 1,264 applications.

If a school district is entitled to something of this kind, it is not going to wait until this late in the year to make application for it. The thing just does not stand to reason, and it does not look as if they knew what they were doing or what they were coming up here for.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. The gentleman realizes, of course, that many of these superintendents of districts and groups that are interested in receiving additional money for their educational needs have been informed that only so much was available. So many of them felt that there was no use presenting their claims, they did not have the money available to meet them. We have always been behind in the amount of appropriations or at least have not come up to the amounts that the districts have needed.

Mr. TABER. I am not so sure about that because the amounts that have been distributed have been reasonably liberal all the way through. I am not going into a discussion with the gentleman because I have given him the figures and the detail. I cannot understand it and I cannot make out a case for a deficiency appropriation at this point. Last year they had \$4,000,000 left. I am not going to say anything more about the particular item at this time.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Truman presented a budget here along in the early part of January. It is going to be absolutely impossible for the new heads of departments to tell us just exactly what they think they can do toward cutting down those demands right away. We are already starting hearings on a bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. TABER. When I have finished with this particular part I will.

We are going into those appropriation estimates just as carefully as we can with the idea of screening them and providing what is necessary for the operation of the Government and not one cent more. We do not and we cannot at this time say to you just what they will need or just what the committee will recom-

mend to you. I can say that the thing will be approached with the idea in mind on the part of every member of the Appropriations Committee of reducing expenditures, and I believe I can say that the minority and the majority will work together to try to bring about that result. There may be difference of opinion on items but not in the effort that will be made to try and bring about a balanced budget. We are going to do our very best on that and we realize fully the tremendous responsibility that rests upon us and upon the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman as chairman of the Appropriations Committee has had probably a better chance to see what the attitude of the new administration heads is than some of the rest of us; but, on the other hand, some of us who have had an opportunity to discuss these budget problems with the President and to get his views generally and the views of the people in the administration can say to the Members of the House and to the country that this new administration, instead of trying to find ways and means to up all of the expenditures of the Federal Government, is going to join with us in a real, sincere effort to find ways and means of reducing Federal expending. That assurance can be had. It is not fair to say that an Administration that came into office on January 20, with Cabinet positions just being filled, should be expected at this moment to come forward with a whole, complete budget. But let me just say this again for emphasis that before we get through working on these appropriations we will have the help of the Administration and the heads of the departments in trying to reduce spending, and that is something that we have not had for 20 years.

Mr. TABER. And I want to say this, too, that we will have a fine spirit of cooperation in reducing the expenditures all the way down the line on the part of the administration.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. In reply to the gentleman from Indiana, we have heard that kind of speech made in every Congress for the last 20 years when the Congress began its sitting. But now, about this administration coming in 25 or 30 days ago, Mr. Dodge, who in my opinion enjoys as good a reputation as anyone who has been employed by this Administration, in any position in it, has been down here nearly 3 months, and he has worked with Mr. Lawton on this budget. Now he should have some ideas about the various departments and how much can be cut. Of course, we have not passed all the appropriation bills yet, and it will be quite some time before we do. But, I just feel that it would be the fair thing to do, and frankly it would be the honorable thing to do, as soon as possible for this administration to submit budgets on the various matters that will

come before the Committee on Appropriations. And, I ask the gentleman from New York if he does not think that would be a good thing to do.

Mr. TABER. I am certain that the representatives of the administration will communicate their views on what the appropriations ought to be to the committee before reports are required to be made upon these bills, and I am sure that the President will join in those statements.

Mr. RAYBURN. Just a moment. Why not submit them to the Congress? The Committee on Appropriations has secret meetings and secret hearings, and things of that kind. It may never come out of there what they are doing. Why not submit them to the Congress where all budgets are submitted?

Mr. TABER. Here is the situation. When the appropriation bill comes out, the hearings come out with a complete, detailed statement as to what has been done, and that we expect to follow all the way through.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I sense the temper of the people of this country correctly, they are interested in results. Now what they want is that there be a cooperative, good-faith effort between the administrative branch of the Government and the legislative branch of the Government to cut the spending of the Federal Government down as far as we can, maintaining our security and essential governmental functions. Now as to whether or not a detailed budget is sent up here to my mind makes no difference. As a matter of fact, everyone knows that it takes months and months to prepare a budget in that detail. What we have and what we are working on now is the Truman budget. I never saw a Truman budget that could not be cut. As a matter of fact, we have cut them time and again and we are going to cut this one, and make no mistake about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

[Mr. CANNON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of discussing briefly chapter VIII of this bill which refers to the request submitted by President Truman for \$1,200,000,000 for the armed services.

I am happy to report that after careful consideration the subcommittee in charge of that request reached the unanimous conclusion that it is unnecessary to make any new money available at this time and that the whole request insofar as approved can be taken care of by transfer of funds previously appropriated to the armed services for other purposes without in any way impairing their efficiency.

Members will recall that the armed services had an appropriation for the

current fiscal year of something over \$46 billion. On top of that came this supplemental request, originally in the amount of \$1,444,377,246, subsequently reduced by \$244,377,246 to \$1,200,000,000.

This request, as has been pointed out, resulted from the enactment of legislation during or since consideration and approval of the regular appropriation bill. Four such laws were enacted dealing with military pay increases, mustering-out payments, combat-duty pay and uniform gratuities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD a brief summary of these laws:

NEW LAWS

MILITARY PAY INCREASE

(Public Law 346, approved May 19, 1952)

Under this act—

(a) The rates of basic pay for all members of the uniformed services were increased by 4 percent effective May 1, 1952;

(b) The basic allowance for subsistence for all members was increased by 14 percent;

(c) The basic allowance for quarters for all members, with or without dependents, was increased by 14 percent;

(d) Retired pay of all persons entitled thereto was increased by 4 percent.

MUSTERING OUT PAYMENTS

(Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act, 1952, Public Law 550, approved July 16, 1952)

Title V of this act provides that each member of the Armed Forces in pay grade O-3 (captain in the Army) or below engaged in active service on or after June 27, 1950, who is or has been relieved from active duty under honorable conditions is entitled to mustering out payment of \$300 if he serves for more than 60 days and has served outside the continental United States; \$200 if he served for 60 days but no service outside the United States; \$100 if he performed active duty for less than 60 days.

Under section 503 persons who are discharged prior to the date of the act of July 16, 1952, have 2 years in which to file claims.

Section 803 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1953, Public Law 547, approved July 15, 1952 (p. 11) made "any appropriations available to the Department of Defense available for mustering out payments as authorized by law."

COMBAT DUTY PAY ACT OF 1952

(Title VII of the Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, Public Law 488, approved July 10, 1952 (p. 22))

This act provides combat pay for all members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served in the Korean combat zone on or after June 1, 1950, and who meet the requirements. The act provides for combat pay of \$45 for any month during which the member was part of a combat unit in Korea for not less than 6 days of such month. The law sets up detailed conditions under which a member is entitled to combat pay. Combat service includes service in a vessel while subject to actual fire or explosion in the course of any operation in the Korean combat zone; service in aircraft while subjected to hostile fire in the course of any operation in the Korean combat zone; service while in actual combat on land during any period there is direct contact with and opposition to a hostile force by any military unit while such unit is subjected to hostile ground fire. The law also provides for the payment of combat pay of \$45 per month for service on or after June 1, 1950, in the case of any person who was killed in action, injured in action, or wounded in

action while serving as a member of a combat unit in Korea, and in such case continues for not more than 3 months thereafter during which the person was hospitalized for the treatment of an injury or wound received in action. The \$45 per month is also payable to persons who were captured or entered in missing-in-action status while serving as a member of a combat unit in Korea. Such payments continue for a period of not more than 3 months during which a person was in a missing-in-action or captured status. The combat pay is not payable in addition to aviation pay, submarine pay, or other special or incentive pay.

Under section 707 (b) appropriations currently available for pay and allowances of members of the uniformed service are available for the payment of combat pay under this title for any month prior to the date of enactment of Public Law 488, approved July 10, 1952.

UNIFORM GRATUITIES

(Section 243. Armed Forces Reserve Act, 1952, Public Law 476, 82d Congress, approved July 9, 1952)

In accordance with the pattern of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, this section makes provision for equalizing across the board uniform gratuities for officers of all Reserve components.

This section provides for payment of the following allowances:

(a) Initial uniform allowance of an amount not to exceed \$200 to be paid after January 1, 1953, under certain conditions, such as, upon first reporting for active duty for periods in excess of 90 days and upon completion of certain periods of active and inactive duty training in a Reserve component. This allowance is payable only once to each member.

(b) Active duty allowance of an amount not to exceed \$100 to officers entering on active duty for more than 90 days when 2 years elapse between such periods of active duty. This allowance is payable retroactively to those officers who entered on active duty on or after June 25, 1950.

(c) Maintenance allowance of an amount not to exceed \$50 for each 4 years of satisfactory service in a Reserve component which must include 28 days of active duty training. Extended periods of active duty for 90 days or more are not considered in computing the 4 years for eligibility for the maintenance allowance.

The request for \$1,200,000,000 was taken under consideration by the committee, and in the course of the hearings the armed services volunteered a further reduction of \$145,150,000, reducing the overall request to \$1,054,850,000.

The committee requested and obtained from the armed services statements showing month by month for each of the first 6 months for the present fiscal year actual obligations and actual expenditures, for every appropriation item, as well as estimated figures for the last half of the year. It was in the light of these figures that the committee arrived at the conclusion which I have already indicated, namely, that the full amount of the supplementary request can be offset by transfers from sums already appropriated to the armed services for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that all these savings are savings out of 1953 money. I want to say that in my opinion they are real savings and I want to say further that barring unforeseen developments overseas it is not anticipated that the armed services will come back to the

Congress with any further supplemental or deficiency request in this fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I can explain the action of the committee very quickly, I think, if the Members will turn to the

table which appears in the committee report at pages 29 to 31, inclusive.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the table at this point in the RECORD:

Department of Defense supplementals, 1953

[In thousands]

| Agency and item | Adjusted net request for appropriations | | | Proposed committee transfers to meet net adjusted request | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| | H. Doc. 62 | Subsequent revisions and reductions | Net adjusted requirements | Savings based on scheduled obligations | Freeze-order reductions | Other transfers | Total proposed transfers |
| Office of the Secretary: | | | | | | | |
| Claims..... | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | | | | | |
| Retired pay..... | 25,000 | 25,000 | | | | | |
| Total, Office of the Secretary..... | 26,000 | 26,000 | | | | | |
| Department of the Army: | | | | | | | |
| Military personnel..... | 776,300 | 39,450 | \$735,850 | \$1,500 | | | \$1,500 |
| Civilian relief in Korea..... | 11,700 | 11,700 | | 28,750 | | | 28,750 |
| Maintenance and operations..... | | | | 50,000 | \$51,293 | \$200,000 | 301,293 |
| Reserve personnel requirements, 1953..... | | | | 3,057 | | | 3,057 |
| Reserve personnel requirements, 1952-53..... | | | | 8,541 | | | 8,541 |
| Expansion of production facilities..... | | | | | 12,000 | 75,000 | 87,000 |
| Funds reserved by Air Force..... | | | | | | 295,583 | 295,583 |
| Total, Department of the Army..... | 788,000 | 51,150 | 739,850 | 91,848 | 63,293 | 570,583 | 725,724 |
| Department of the Navy: | | | | | | | |
| Military personnel, Navy..... | 140,000 | | 140,000 | | | | |
| Military personnel, Marine Corps..... | 63,000 | | 63,000 | | | | |
| Navy personnel, general expenses..... | | | | 1,850 | | | 1,850 |
| Marine Corps, troops and facilities..... | | | | 40,234 | | | 40,234 |
| Ships and facilities..... | | | | 71,439 | 11,778 | | 83,217 |
| Aircraft and facilities..... | | | | | 4,921 | | 4,921 |
| Ordnance and facilities..... | | | | 49,202 | 8,066 | | 57,268 |
| Medical care..... | | | | 5,763 | | | 5,763 |
| Civil engineering..... | | | | 5,722 | | | 5,722 |
| Service-wide operations..... | | | | 2,407 | | | 2,407 |
| Officer candidate program, 1952-53..... | | | | 852 | | | 852 |
| Officer candidate program, 1953-54..... | | | | 776 | | | 776 |
| Total, Department of the Navy..... | 203,000 | | 203,000 | 178,215 | 24,755 | | 203,000 |
| Department of the Air Force: | | | | | | | |
| Military personnel requirements..... | 183,000 | 68,000 | 115,000 | | | | |
| Maintenance and operations..... | | | | 47,463 | 67,537 | | 115,000 |
| Total, Department of the Air Force..... | 183,000 | 68,000 | 115,000 | 47,463 | 67,537 | | 115,000 |
| Grand total, Department of Defense..... | 1,200,000 | 145,150 | 1,054,850 | 317,556 | 155,585 | 570,583 | 1,043,724 |

¹ The difference of \$11,126,000 between this amount of \$1,043,724,000 and the net adjusted requirements of \$1,054,850,000 represents deletion by the committee of additional funds requested by the Army for station allowances.

At the bottom of column 1 you will note the request for \$1,200,000,000.

In column 2 you will find the savings volunteered by the armed services in the amount of \$145,150,000, leaving a balance at the bottom of column 3 of \$1,054,850,000.

The offsets which the committee proposes to that \$1,054,850,000 appear in the next three columns, columns 4, 5, and 6, and in the footnote at the bottom of the table.

Column 4, totaling \$317,556,000, results from the addition of anticipated unobligated balances as of June 30 next, according to the statements of the armed services themselves. Surely there can be no objection to applying that against the deficiency.

Column 5 totaling \$155,585,000 results from assuming that the February rate of obligation will not exceed the January rate, because of the so-called freeze

order of February 3, 1953, of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which, as you know, provide that there should be "no increase over the January rate of obligations except on complete justification and specific approval unless such increases are clearly necessary to meet the requirements fixed by law." Surely there can be no objection to applying any such savings to the deficiency request.

Column 6, totaling \$570,583,000, results from three suggested savings, to each of which I shall refer very briefly.

The first item is a saving of \$200 million with respect to Maintenance and Operations, Army. A statement of obligations under this item indicates that if the obligation figure for the first 6 months of the fiscal year is doubled the resulting figure is \$3,888,444,000, which is about \$1 billion less than the total amount available for this purpose. The

committee felt justified in taking 20 percent of that \$1 billion and applying it against the deficiency.

The second item is a saving of \$75 million in respect to Expansion of Production Facilities. This results, again, from a statement of obligations under this item. The average monthly obligation rate has run somewhere in the neighborhood of \$40 million. The estimated obligations for May and June appear unrealistic. When \$75 million is deducted and applied against the supplemental request the result is to leave about \$190 million or an average of \$95 million available for obligating in May and June, the last 2 months of the fiscal year, or more than double the amount actually obligated in any previous month.

The final item is a saving of \$295,583,000, obtained by reducing funds reserved by the Air Force for contingent obligations in fiscal 1954. The amount of that fund was \$646,910,000. After the suggested deduction, there will remain in the fund \$351,327,000.

The committee has disallowed an item of \$11,126,000 for station allowances. The matter will be reviewed in connection with the regular bill for the fiscal year 1954.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that these savings and transfers are all out of 1953 money. In my opinion, they all constitute real savings. They are over and above the savings and transfers authorized in respect to items of \$244,377,246 and \$145,150,000 volunteered by the armed services.

I repeat that, in the absence of unexpected developments, it is not anticipated that the armed services will return for any further supplemental or deficiency appropriation during the present fiscal year.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not only should there be no request for a deficiency but if the present indications prove out as we think they will there will be an opportunity for a rather substantial rescission.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the gentleman may prove to be correct.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one closing observation. At the completion of the work of the committee the suggested savings were taken up with responsible officials in the Department of Defense. After discussion with them, there was general agreement that the sum total here involved could probably be absorbed. There were some slight differences of opinion, however, as to the best sources from which to absorb the necessary funds. At the suggestion of the Defense officials therefore the committee incorporated a provision, which you will find in the bill, giving the Secretary of Defense broad discrimination as to the sources from which these savings may be drawn, provided, as is indicated in the report, that any departure deemed essential from the program of savings

suggested by the committee shall be cleared by the committee in advance.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this explains the action of the committee.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts, he means to say that we really do not have to appropriate this money and that the money is already there?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is correct. The committee found sufficient unobligated balances, sufficient savings in respect of the month of February, and sufficient savings in three other items to offset entirely the new money requested.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. NICHOLSON. On this matter of education, do we appropriate a considerable amount of money in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps or other items of defense, let us say, for so many school teachers and so many pupils and for everything that we maintain in Germany and other countries?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There are very considerable funds utilized for educational purposes in the armed services. I am not in a position at the moment to give the gentleman detailed information in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on the Department of Defense.

MILITARY SPENDING—NEED FOR ECONOMY WITHOUT LOSS OF MILITARY STRENGTH

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I proceed on the theory this afternoon that the budget estimates that we are considering are the budget estimates of the present administration.

I certainly do not believe that the leaders of the present administration would submit to us budget requests other than their own. After all, the bill before us today calls for vast additional spending of the taxpayer's money, and the budget estimate upon which this bill is based should be the budget estimate of the party which is in power in the executive branch of the Government and in Congress.

For the present administration to present to us for consideration in connection with the pending bill, budget estimates other than its own would be a confession of incompetence, a confession of inability to fulfill the role of national leadership. Our people, by their votes, have asked for a change, and it would be most improper for the party in power to seek to present a budget request of the former administration or hide behind a smokescreen.

But we must not be unreasonable. It is true that the Republican Party has had since last November to formulate a budget for all the agencies of the Government. This has been a long time,

but not enough time for the formulation of a new budget for each and every agency of the Government. I hope we may have the complete Republican budget in the near future, but all I am asking for now is the budget estimate of the party now in power on the items involving in excess of a billion dollars, which are included in the pending bill. We are entitled to know whether the party in power is for these items or against them. The point is that we are entitled to consider today the budget estimate of the present administration and not of the Truman administration.

When our committee convenes to consider military appropriations for the coming fiscal year I shall, of course, ask the Secretary of Defense if the requests for money which he is making are his own. If the requests are not his own, and if he has no budget, I shall suggest to him that he please return to the Pentagon and itemize what his minimum requirements for money are and give us a firm basis upon which to proceed. A mere novice in legislative matters will realize that such a request on my part is the only proper procedure to follow.

Mr. Chairman, our chief interest here is not so much in what has been inherited by the present party in power; rather, we are interested in what we are going to do about what we have inherited.

Now I want to speak briefly about military programs. The military features of the pending bill involved the largest sums. No public official would dare appear in the role of the defender of the military, and certainly I do not appear in that role today. Attacking the Military Establishment is the best and safest way to get a favorable headline. But headlines are not our concern. The welfare of our country is, I fervently hope, the objective of Republicans and Democrats alike. Let me say that on the Appropriations Committee, we do not deal in partisanship and in politics. The Committee on Appropriations has by and large been nonpartisan through the years, and I believe and I predict that it will be nonpartisan this year.

Our Republican friends on the Appropriations Committee cooperated with us in the Democratic majority last year and enabled us to cut the Truman budget by \$8½ billion. Certainly I wish to say to the gentlemen on the left, the Republican side, that I shall cooperate with them in undertaking, when the budget of the new administration is presented, to cut it by as many billions of dollars as may be reasonably possible. I trust that we can do even a better job cutting the fiscal budget of the new administration than we did the previous administration. But let us see the pattern as soon as we can, please.

PROSPECTS FOR MILITARY SAVINGS

We have a perfect setup for saving this year in the Military Establishment. It is a wonderful picture. It gratifies my heart. After all, in the Military Establishment is where most of the money is spent. I do not discount the fact that we must save money in all agencies and wherever possible. However, if you are going to balance the budget and save

really big money, you must save billions in the Department of Defense or you do not save enough to change materially the fiscal picture. Moreover, there are only certain areas in the Defense Department where you can save money. If you are going to have 3,700,000 men in uniform as presently planned, and you have to pay them so much, and there is a movement on to raise their pay, it is a simple matter of mathematics. The law fixes the rate of pay. You cannot save anything there unless you reduce the number of soldiers or reduce their pay. In the military pay and allowance item will be found about 20 percent of defense spending. Almost another 20 percent is in the field of maintenance and operation. There are several rather large areas of defense spending where real savings are practically impossible.

But there is one big place where you can save vast sums in the Department of Defense. That is in the field of procurement, because 60 percent of every defense dollar goes to procurement—buying stuff, hard goods and soft goods, principally the products of industry and big business. In the field of procurement real savings can be made if our defense leaders have the skill and the will to get the job done.

We are fortunate in this regard that in key places in the Department of Defense we have businessmen of unquestioned integrity and very great skill. Now is the time for American business to pay off, in the interest of the taxpayers, because they sit in the seats of the mighty. If they do their job and do it well, they will save billions of dollars. I estimate that since the Korean war started Congress has appropriated more than \$80 billion for procurement—for buying things like ammunition, airplanes, tanks, ships, guided missiles, and so forth. A 10-percent saving would be \$10 billion in velvet for the taxpayer. I fear that if our new defense leaders do not save billions of dollars, they will tend to dampen the enthusiasm of our people for the leadership of American business in government.

For years I have been saying on this floor and in committee and to our military leaders in the Pentagon that what we needed was people in the field of procurement in the Department of Defense who could get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent, and prevent the taxpayer being mercilessly gouged upon occasions by manufacturers of defense items. Now we have men in the Pentagon who are able to see the picture clearly, who know it from the other side, who can save us billions of dollars if they will but do it. Too often in the past, timid lieutenant colonels and underpaid civilians have been going out and matching their wits with big business, and the taxpayer has paid the penalty of increased costs, despite the pleas which some of us have made in the cause of better management in the Military Establishment. But now we have a beautiful set-up in this particular field.

I hope Secretary Wilson himself, one of the foremost businessmen of our generation, will sit around the conference

table as the taxpayer's representative when contracts involving billions are made and see to it that we get our money's worth. This is no job to delegate to a timid underling. A little pounding of the table and shrewd contracting by one of the foremost industrialists of our time should pay off in a big way for our economy-minded country.

Not only that, there is another person in the picture. We have in the White House a soldier-statesman for whom I have great respect and affection. If there ever was a man who could lead his administration in making the Defense Establishment save money, he is the man. He knows it from the inside and the outside. He knows it up and down and all around. If anybody can pinpoint duplication and waste of money and manpower in the Defense Department he can do it. He was Chief of Staff of our Army. He was the Supreme Allied Commander of our military forces in World War II in Europe. At one time he was the Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. More recently he was the head of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the so-called NATO Army in Europe, and before World War II he had responsible duty in industrial mobilization in the War Department. He is ideally suited to his job in the particular field of national defense where the main cuts and savings must be made if the taxpayer is to have relief in the biggest field of Government spending.

So it is a very pleasing thing, and I want President Eisenhower to know that we are going to stand behind him in a program of military strength at a minimum cost to the taxpayer. I have the most sincere admiration for the President and I believe he will do everything he can to do a good job. He needs our cooperation and our help, and I believe our Congress will work with him for the common good.

We should make it clear to our able business leaders in the Department of Defense that we are going to stand behind them in their efforts to get real economy in the field where they are best able to get it.

If they will, whenever necessary, crack the heads of big business, shave down the profits to the big manufacturers, and forget any allegiance they may have had to business colleagues who remain out of Government, the prospects for good management and cheaper defense costs should be bright. I have faith in these leaders. I am not trying to be severe. I am simply saying what every body knows that the spotlight is playing on the Pentagon today, and it will continue to play there with the taxpayers and the Congress watching—watching hopefully. If they fail to do this job of reduction in that area where it probably must be made, and not at the expense of national defense, let me warn them in the beginning of their administration that they will call down upon their heads the righteous wrath of the American taxpayer and the Congress of the United States. I am happy to say that I am

hopeful. I am encouraged to believe that they will be able to do it. They have got a hard job, but they are big men. They must not permit themselves to become the captives of the admirals and the generals, and yet they must not ignore sound military advice and the technical facts of life which only our able admirals and generals are best qualified to give. It is a very tough assignment; all must agree. I pause long enough to say I have no patience with those who undertake to sell our military leadership short.

The problem is cutting military spending without reducing military strength. If I were to write an open letter from the floor of the House this afternoon to the Secretary of Defense and his businessmen-associates, I would say to them: When you are convinced that economies can be made, national defense promoted, and the taxpayer served, do not let anyone, not even the top brass in the Pentagon, the admirals and the generals, dissuade you. In other words, in the language of the current song: Don't Let the Stars Get in Your Eyes. Our plea is that you do a job for the taxpayer and the American people on the defense budget.

Our defense chiefs cannot do their job if, at the slightest provocation, they go gallivanting about the country at the taxpayers' expense in 4-motored aircraft making speeches to Chambers of Commerce, laudable as that may be. Only if they stick to their knitting will they be able to do the job for the taxpayer which urgently needs to be done. Reports indicate that they are going to stay at their posts of duty here.

PREVIOUS MILITARY PROGRAMS

We cut the military budget last year in excess of \$5 billion; let us make a bigger cut this year if we safely can. Let us make sure, however, that we do not harm the interest of national defense. Let us take a quick look at the picture: In calendar year 1950 we appropriated \$25 billion for national defense; in 1951 we appropriated, by reason of the Korean war and the threat of a much bigger war, \$82 billion. But we started the trend downward last year; we appropriated only \$47 billion, \$35 billion less than the previous year. Can this Congress equal the record which the last Congress made of appropriating \$35 billion less on defense in 1953 than it did in 1952? That is the record we made last year. But that statement taken by itself is unfair and misleading. It is true, however, that in the calendar year 1951 we appropriated \$82 billion. We brought it down to \$45 billion last year, but we cannot bring it down to the extent of an additional \$35 billion this year; that is impossible. That would mean an appropriation for the Department of Defense this year of only \$12 billion. But certainly if the international situation does not worsen we ought to cut down below a \$40 billion figure; and I would like to urge the new defense chiefs to join with us, shall I say the Democratic minority, and I believe my Republican colleagues too, in trying to bring it this year below \$40 billion without impairing national defense.

Nineteen fifty-one was the peak year. Let us hope we can go on downward, because we provided previously for the principal funds for the buildup of our fighting strength. We have about financed the program for the initial buildup of our forces—our goal has never been full mobilization because we hope for peace and we could not afford indefinitely a posture of full mobilization. We can certainly go downward this year unless there are unforeseen developments, and we will have no cause to boast unless we cut military appropriations this year below \$40 billion. Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me is the picture we have before us. I think it is an encouraging one because we have men who know how to do this job in positions of power.

Let us all join together in helping them, and let us all restrain our criticism and give more in cooperation and understanding than in bitterness and criticism. Our people at home would sanction that spirit.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we may have the military budget of this administration as soon as possible because I for one do not contemplate going through long committee hearings on a budget which is not accepted and presented to the Congress by the administration in power.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, that part of the bill which came before the subcommittee of which I am chairman has to do with various agencies in the section for the independent offices, beginning on page 21 of the bill. The briefest way that I can call it to your attention is to ask you to turn to pages 23 and 24 where a digest is made of the requests before the subcommittee and in turn our recommendations to the full committee which were accepted by that committee.

The way to save your time is for me to refer only to those parts of this budget which you yourselves may be questioned about.

If you will take the Veterans' Administration you will find an original request for \$18 million in the bill. I want you to understand that none of the money requested for operating costs of any of the hospitals has been reduced. That is the complete amount asked for by the Veterans' Administration and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The other cuts may be found under two heads, first a cut which was made prior to the meeting of the subcommittee. Some savings were indicated and some money was available which they did not know about when the budget was made up. The second is reduced by less than the amount of money represented by the number of additional employees which it was the intention to add to the rolls. It is the desire of the administration not to add employees at the present time, and a very slight increase in the efficiency of the present staff, about 2 percent increase of efficiency could make this unnecessary.

Mr. Chairman, this, in my opinion, is a well-balanced suggestion on the part

of the subcommittee. I also call your attention to the fact that in the item covering compensation and pensions we made no cut at all because eventually that is a debt against the Government and we must pay it.

In the following item, readjustment benefits, while we have cut it in the amount of \$131 million, this is done on the basis indicated at page 195 of the hearings. We asked the Veterans' Administration if they knew what the request should be at the present time and they said they did not. Then we asked whether or not they would know better when they came before us with the regular bill. This appears at page 195. My question was: "Will you know more accurately 2 months from now?"

And the answer is: "We will have had that much experience because at that time we will know what the demands from the Korea war are," at which time the committee will take care of the item.

I think of nothing else that you are apt to be asked about.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman's subcommittee was very kind to extend an audience to representatives of the American Legion in Pennsylvania who were greatly concerned about hospital beds in the Philadelphia area. I notice that you have included in the report in connection with this part of the estimate the statement that the committee specifically directs the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to take such immediate steps as may be essential to furnish adequate hospital facilities for needy veterans in the Philadelphia area. I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to explain the thinking behind that statement.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. I would like to say, instead of the gentleman expressing any thanks to the subcommittee, the subcommittee thanks the representatives from Pennsylvania for having brought this matter to our attention. The Veterans' Administration has been leasing, in the naval hospital in Philadelphia, a number of beds which at the beginning of the year was estimated at 350 a month. It was the intention of the Veterans' Administration, as a new VA hospital in Philadelphia was built, to drop beds out of the contract at the naval hospital. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out, the schedule did not work quite the way they intended it to work, as a result of which there are at the present time only about 160 beds available at the moment in the veterans' hospital and only about 100 beds still under contract at the naval hospital.

Now this is a double-barreled problem because if we take the patients out of the naval hospital and do not have a place to put them, not only do we have veterans needing a bed, but we have a condition in which the naval hospital could actually lose its rating because it has less than the percentage number of patients to the number of beds. It is pro-

posed that we earmark the money. The committee did not think that was desirable, nor a specific indication of the number of beds, because what is needed is somewhere between 350 and 400 beds in that area. They can be in one hospital or another. It does not necessarily mean that the number should be activated in the veterans' hospital now if it is better to put the veterans in the naval hospital.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I wonder if the gentleman would agree to an amendment being offered after the figure \$10 million to specify and spell out the number of beds that are needed in Philadelphia, particularly the amount of money required.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would not think it was a good idea. I would think it was the reverse of a good idea. With all of the very high regard I have for the gentleman from Pennsylvania I would probably feel myself compelled to oppose it because I think we would do better if we put it on the ground that there shall be provided in Philadelphia the number of beds that are needed there. As the gentleman pointed out, the VA is taking Pennsylvania veterans and carrying them to Dayton, Ohio, Richmond, Va., to Wilkes-Barre, to East Orange, and to Fort Howard. It is a problem that cannot be spelled out properly in a bill, and I think since we have the Veterans' Administration coming back in not over 30 days, even before this bill is signed by the President probably—I am not quite sure what its timetable would be—we would be better off to leave it as the committee wrote it in there because I think the result will be good for the veterans.

Mr. FENTON. What assurance have we got that they will be taken care of?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If I were the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration or the Bureau of the Budget and I had been told by a subcommittee that I had to do something, and I had to come back in about 30 days and ask that same subcommittee for more money, I think I would be careful to do what the subcommittee asked.

Mr. FENTON. That has not been the experience in the past.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not proper to assume here that the language you have in your committee report represents instructions on the part of the subcommittee and, if approved by this body, the instructions of the House of Representatives that the Veterans' Administration shall correct this situation in Philadelphia?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The subcommittee understands it that way, and I hope the House will understand it that way and support it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations for the armed services [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] showed in yielding me this time, but I should like to have the RECORD show that I am second in line in the minority, following the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. Chairman, you have heard the explanation of the supplemental by the gentlemen who have preceded me. Insofar as this supplemental applies to the armed services, the method which has been pursued by our subcommittee has been that of recapturing unobligated funds and reassigning those funds; consequently, it does not constitute appropriation of new money as such. This method of procedure has been followed on previous occasions and, in my opinion, is quite in keeping with proper conclusions and close scrutiny by the Armed Services Appropriations Subcommittee.

In reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, I find that there seems to be dissatisfaction on the part of some Members of the other body with the methods pursued in the handling of appropriation measures, both in the formative stages and in subsequent processing. I should not say that we have a perfect system by any means. No doubt improvements could be made, and should be made, but I have yet to see any proposal that would result in a marked improvement in end results.

I have been on the Appropriations Committee of the House for 14 years. For 8 years of that period I have been chairman of the subcommittee having immediate jurisdiction of naval appropriations. I have learned during that service that there is no substitute for hard, industrious, personal application. Investigators and capable, industrious clerks are indispensable, but the responsibility is solely that of a committee member, and to exercise it he must study, inform himself, and apply himself.

Expenditures and taxes are very live questions today. They should be. All of us want each held to the lowest levels consistent with the proper discharge of governmental programs and policies. That has been the determined objective of the Appropriations Committee throughout the period of time I have been a member of the committee.

Much of our difficulty ensues from authorizing legislation. Appropriations are provided to implement authorizations. If you do not want to spend the money on something, do not authorize it. When you have authorized something, it is not for the Committee on Appropriations to say that it will not follow up with the necessary money. It has a command from higher authority. It is merely an agent of the House.

There are many who entertain the view that an improved situation would result from resort to a one-package appropriation bill. It sounds plausible, I admit. But what advantage does it offer over the present procedure? One, and it is the main argument advanced for it, is that under present practice we do not know where we stand until we get through. Now, just how true is that? We have an estimated receipt

and expenditure figure at the start. There is and always has been maintained in the Committee on Appropriations, open to inspection, a progress sheet, and in recent years progress reports, in tabular form, have been printed periodically in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In that way we are always advised of where we stand as separate measures are processed through their legislative courses. The end result is controllable until the last, and at all stages there is before us a track of our course.

Then we are told that under a one-package bill there would be better control of expenditures from prior-year appropriations. One would infer that these prior-year funds, once provided, are forgotten. Personally, I do not like the imputation. Normally, such prior-year balances are not large. They are large now because of the defense preparation effort we began following the outbreak of war in Korea. In large part they are not free balances. They are obligated but not expended. They apply in large measure to long-lead-time procurement. But small or large, committed or uncommitted, they are carefully canvassed during hearings on new money requests, and just as much so as they would be under a one-package bill arrangement, and they are just as controllable.

It is my judgment that better consideration of appropriation measures is had under present practice than would be had under the one-package procedure. The responsibility for each measure now rests squarely upon the subcommittee having jurisdiction. In practice, considering the human equation, that responsibility would be lessened when a separate appropriation category became merely a chapter of an omnibus measure. When you lessen it, you detract from the incentive or the urge for doing the very splendid kind of job that I have witnessed performed by many of my colleagues over the years. No, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the adoption of a one-package bill would merely be an accommodation to the theorists. The Committee on Appropriations is alive to its responsibilities and will function effectively and efficiently if allowed to proceed in such ways as it determines will best serve the public interests. If its reports are not sufficiently full or comprehensive, they can be made so, and just as well under present practice as under a one-package bill procedure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with another proposal.* This one assumes that we do not have the right kind of information, or that it is not accessible to us, or that we do not know how to obtain it. What we need, it appears, is a superappropriations committee, made up of House and Senate Members who are members of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses. These Members are to divorce themselves from their normal committee functions and inform themselves about the budget and then pass along to their committees, and I quote, "the necessary information for the adequate consideration of the budget." I ask you, when, in common-

sense, under that proposal, would the committees get down to work.

This proposed supercommittee is charged with many functions. I invite you to look at pages 933 to 936 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6. It sounds very much like a grandiose scheme to build up a budget bureau in the Congress charged with work and responsibilities of existing committees. One may read in it, a back-door approach to letting the other body in on the initiation of revenue and appropriation measures, distinctly a House prerogative under the Constitution, and one that has been jealously guarded down through the years.

I am firmly of the opinion that the Appropriations Committee of the House is thoroughly competent to discharge effectively and efficiently the tasks with which it is charged.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman's statement is one of the finest I have heard in a long time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, it does not need any supercommittee. All the information it needs it has the means at its disposal to acquire. Staff help in skill and numbers may be had for the asking, and will be availed of and utilized as and when the need develops. Of course, information from responsible sources is desired and is always welcome, but I want to see and shall do my part to see that the committee is free to run its affairs, to make its own determinations, and that it is free of domination by supergroups and is not hamstrung and befogged by a host of subordinates who would largely be in the way, occupying valuable space, and swelling the total of the legislative budget. Some of those who are presently proposing the supercommittee have been the most loud in criticizing superdepartments in Government wherein layers of authority have been placed one upon the other. I can see no difference between a superdepartmental structure than that which has recently been proposed to apply to the Appropriations Committee. I personally do not feel that exaggerated intelligence is vested in any specific individual on either side of the Capitol. When it is all said and done, under our routine procedure, conferences are usually held by and between the House and Senate which, in my opinion, work out an intelligent compromise that invariably takes care of any issue where errors of judgment may prevail. Let us review the supercommittee proposals with extra caution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

(Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks made by the

gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], and I reiterate the fact that if each committee of the House, both those which bring forth new legislation and the appropriation committees will exercise restraint, and will do their job properly, economy can be had, and a supercommittee is unnecessary.

I wish to pay tribute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], former chairman of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee. He has promised—and his promises are made to be kept—cooperation in our efforts to reduce Federal spending, particularly as it relates to the military. I could not quite tell whether he was indicting the Pentagon of the past, that is, up to the 20th of January, or whether he was merely acting as elder statesman and giving the newcomers a little fatherly advice. Perhaps both. But certainly in his capacity as chairman of the committee he [Mr. MAHON] has seen for years the Pentagon in action, and if anyone is qualified to give them advice it is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], as he so well did when he told them not to let the stars get in their eyes. He knows, as I know, that every once in a while that has happened, and some people have not used their own individual independent judgment because they have been so glamorized, and once in a while so blinded by the reflection from those stars.

I know that the experience I have had through the years on the Military Appropriations Subcommittee will be the pattern set in the future; and all of us working together as a committee and not as partisans, we will, I can assure the gentleman from Texas, do a very good job of bringing down to a reasonable amount the figures which will be presented to this body in a few short weeks.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] asked a few moments ago about the amounts we were appropriating for education of the dependents of our military forces. For his information I would like to advise, in round figures, that in 1953, we appropriated \$3,900,000 for the education of Army children overseas; \$3,400,000 for the education of Air Force children overseas; and approximately \$2 million for the education of naval children, in other words, approximately \$10 million is being appropriated annually for the education of dependents of our military forces.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. That is for the education of their children overseas?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, for the education of their children overseas; there is another program that makes some contribution for those here within the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we have before us today has been very well explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], chairman of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee. In the minds of at least a few of you there has been some apprehension

about what the effect has been in transferring certain funds from the Reserves and the National Guard. If there is any question in your mind about whether that can or cannot be done without interfering with the activities of those two Reserve forces, you may turn to page 487 where General Decker in response to a question which I asked him, makes a statement and shows how the \$60 million can be transferred from those two activities and offered the observation on the part of this pay increase which is now before us all without harm to their programs.

Then, again, some of you probably have received communications from men in the service in which they have complained that they have not been receiving the promotions in rank which they had been promised, and to which they were entitled. Last year the Army Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes] went into that question with General Collins and told him that we had received those complaints and that he should make request for adequate funds so that these men could be promoted. Those men had been told they were not getting the promotions because Congress did not give the Army the money. Congress has always been the whipping boy—Congress did not give them enough money, so they were told; that they could not make the promotions because the Army did not have the money. If the Army did not have the money it was their own fault, because they got every cent for military pay they ever asked for. We are assured that in this supplemental which they Army is now requesting that there is money so these promotions can be made and these men can be paid in their promoted ranks, promotions which the men deserve.

Another matter which deserves a great deal of consideration is that of civilian relief in Korea. You will notice in the hearings that when the Army witnesses started out in their justifications there was to have been a request made for supplemental funds running better than \$11 billion-plus. Before the hearings on civil relief in Korea, which start on page 555 of the printed hearings—before we had gone very far in a very unsatisfactory presentation we were told that the request for additional funds and new money was being withdrawn.

Now that probably raises some apprehension, but if you will turn to page 559 you will find that there is not a bit of reason for any misapprehension. The Army has plenty of money for this relief to last them the rest of this year—and then some—if it is properly handled.

We have already appropriated \$177 million for civilian relief in Korea and of that \$177 million as of December 31, 1952, only \$43 million have been obligated and but \$23 million have been actually spent. So that you can see from those figures that there is far more than enough to take care of civilian relief in Korea, during the remainder of this fiscal year when I say that I do not discount the need that exists there. Any of you who have been in Korea, any of you who have seen the civilians in

Pusan, around Seoul and other Korean communities know that there is no place in the world where there is more abject poverty. Heartbreaking? Certainly. Strange as it may sound and as illogical as it is, the truth of the matter is that the Communist Chinese prisoners on Koje-do are faring better than the civilians in Korea. These prisoners are fed better, they are clothed better, they are better sheltered, they have a better medical service than the Korean civilians, yet they are prisoners of war. With all of that, if there was a proper, economic, sound, sane, sensible program of distribution of relief goods in Korea, we could get as much as we are getting now with half of the money. The greater part of the whole story is all here in the hearings. It is somewhat garbled. Take, as an example, a boatload of rice. We pay for it. We pay for the transportation. When it reaches the port of Pusan it is immediately turned over to the Korean Government for distribution. What happens after that is not always a pleasant story.

It seems to me, after all, that we have furnished enough funds and there are certainly enough alphabetical agencies over there to do the job. As a matter of fact, there are too many. There is too much confusion; these agencies should be thinned out and there should be a new look taken at civilian relief in Korea before we appropriate any money for 1954. We cannot do everything they want us to do. It seems to me, and I measure my words carefully when I say this, that it comes with some ill grace from President Syngman Rhee in the words he is reported to have uttered last night that the trouble, the inflation, and want are due to the United States and the actions which we have or have not taken. It was not the United States that revalued the Korean money, it was not the United States that caused the price of rice to jump until it will be impossible for the civilians in Korea to buy the rice.

Inflation does exist—it has long existed in Korea. In fact, the going rate of exchange is 18,000 won per United States dollar. However, the United States is dealing with the Korean Government on the basis of 6,000 won per dollar. In other words, the United States and our soldiers pay three times as many dollars for any given item than we should.

Only a few days ago the Korean Republic revalued its money. Prices immediately jumped, so that under the existing agreement of 6,000 won we will pay still more dollars for any purchases we make. The United States is the victim of—not the cause of—the Korean inflation.

Besides the civilian relief dollars, the United States pours in uncounted other millions—yes; billions. The United States furnishes arms, supplies, and so forth, to the Korean troops. We pay the Republic of Korea a considerable dollar rental for the use of the Korean railroads to transport military supplies for Korean troops as well as our own and those of our allies.

Our relations with Korea are complex. They are of vital importance.

However, it is the taxpayers of the United States who are paying the bill. Our relations with Korea, the present agreement on the rate of exchange, our burden and program of the relief of Korean civilians are all matters needing a thorough review before more money is appropriated. So, Mr. Chairman, I have requested that the staff of our committee go thoroughly into this and other matters relating to our spending in Korea before funds are provided for fiscal 1954.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief statement in connection with the second supplemental appropriation bill now under consideration with reference to the appropriations originally requested by the Department of Defense.

In its original submission of a supplemental appropriation request, the Department of Defense asked for \$1,200,000,000 to complete fiscal 1953. These funds were needed to pay some minor amounts for claims, retired pay, and civilian relief in Korea, and also for some very large amounts needed to pay for four acts of Congress passed in the 82d Congress which were not originally considered in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1953. Thus, the Army asked for \$776,300,000, the Navy \$140 million, the Marine Corps \$63 million and the Air Force \$183 million. Now, the Army needs \$708,031,598, the Navy \$181,443,000, the Marine Corps \$76 million and the Air Force \$167 million to pay for their new laws previously authorized by the Congress, which I will discuss in a moment.

The differences in the total amounts requested by each military department and the amounts needed to pay for these new laws results from the authority provided in the appropriation act to pay out of the Defense Appropriation Act such sums as were required to meet these anticipated increased benefits. Revised personnel planning and other adjustments have permitted the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force to absorb some of these increased expenditures.

Now, let us look at these recently enacted laws which have cost, or will cost, some \$1,132,474,598.

On May 19, 1952, the Military Pay Increase Act became law resulting in a total increased expenditure of \$303,601,678 for the Armed Forces for fiscal 1953. You will recall that this granted an increase of 4 percent in basic pay and a 14 percent increase in allowances.

Then we passed the Armed Forces Reserve Act of July 9, 1952, and part of that act provided for uniform allowances for Reserve officers. The Army was the only one that needed additional funds for this purpose and they requested an additional \$544,000 for fiscal 1953. Then the Congress amended the 1953 Appropriation Act by adding title VII which became known as the Combat Duty Pay

Act. This was retroactive to May 31, 1950 and provided for an additional \$45 a month in pay under certain limited qualifications. To pay the retroactive costs involved and to provide for the remainder of fiscal 1953 for this act alone would cost \$179,657,120. Bear in mind that this was an act of Congress which amended the appropriations act but no appropriations were provided in that law for these benefits. And on July 16, 1952, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 was passed, title V of which provided for mustering-out payments. This act was reported out from the Veterans' Affairs Committee and was not considered by the House Committee on Armed Services. It was patterned after the World War II Mustering Out Payment Act and permitted discharged personnel to be paid sums of \$100, \$200, or \$300, depending upon their type of service upon discharge. This provision of law was also retroactive for anyone who had been engaged in service on or after June 27, 1950, and the total costs for fiscal 1953, including the retroactive payments, will amount to \$648,671,800.

Now, totaling these sums it can be seen that the Congress in the latter part of the last session enacted specific laws authorizing the expenditure of public funds amounting to \$1,132,474,598 and this amount of money was not provided for in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1953. I must assume that the Congress was well aware of the fact that authorizations of this type had to be paid for some time. The money was not provided for in the Defense Appropriation Act of 1953. Thus, it was necessary for the Department of Defense to submit a supplemental appropriation request for \$1,200,000,000, the vast majority of which was to pay for the acts which I have just discussed.

Now during the hearings on this supplemental appropriation bill, the Department of Defense witnesses indicated that they could reduce the \$1,200,000,000 request in the amount of \$145,150,000 by savings within the appropriation concerned or by the transfer of funds from other appropriations. In other words, some savings can be effected because of revised personnel planning and by making use of funds appropriated for other purposes.

But this still left a net requirement of \$1,054,850,000. It should be remembered that the money to provide for the pay increase, the uniform allowances, the combat duty pay, and mustering out pay has to date come out of the military appropriations for pay for each of the respective services. It is obvious, therefore, that unless some definite action is taken, these appropriations will be completely exhausted within the next 2 or 3 months. So it was equally obvious to the Department of Defense that they had to either obtain an appropriation of \$1,054,850,000 to complete fiscal 1953, or at the very least, had to obtain authority to transfer funds from existing appropriations.

It is my understanding from reading the report of the Appropriations Committee that none of the \$1,200,000,000 requested by the Department has been

authorized in the second supplemental appropriation bill. I also gather from reading the report that the Appropriation Committee will permit the Department of Defense to effect savings or to transfer from existing appropriations the sum of \$1,043,724,000. This is \$11,126,000 less than the amount requested by the Department of Defense after taking into consideration the transfers and savings that the Department itself stated could definitely be effected at this time. The \$11,126,000 for special per diem allowances for overseas personnel was not authorized because the committee was not satisfied with the basis for the justification presented by the Department of Defense.

As I read the proposed legislation, these transfers from existing appropriations will be permitted after determination has been made by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. In other words, as I understand the proposed bill, the military departments will be authorized to transfer from existing appropriations \$1 million for claims, \$25 million for retired pay, \$725,724,000 for pay for military personnel of the Army, \$140 million for pay for military personnel of the Navy, \$63 million for pay for military personnel of the Marine Corps, and \$115 million for pay for military personnel of the Air Force.

In the report, the Appropriations Committee indicates that the Army, for example, can transfer \$1,500,000 from military personnel funds, \$28,750,000 from civilian relief in Korea, \$301,293,000 from the appropriation for maintenance and operations, \$3,057,000 from reserve requirements for fiscal 1953, \$8,541,000 for reserve personnel requirements for fiscal 1952 and 1953, \$87 million from expansion of production facilities and \$295,583,000 from funds reserved for the Air Force.

The report indicates that the Navy may be able to meet its requirements by transferring from its appropriations \$1,850,000 from general expenses of Navy personnel, \$40,234,000 from troops and facilities of the Marine Corps, \$83,187,000 from ships and facilities, \$4,921,000 from aircraft and facilities, \$57,288,000 from ordnance and facilities, \$5,763,000 from medical care, \$5,722,000 from civil engineering, \$2,407,000 from servicewide operations, \$852,000 from officer candidate programs of fiscal 1952 and 1953, and \$776,000 from officer candidate programs from fiscal 1953 and 1954. And the report further indicates that the Air Force can absorb its additional funds from a transfer of \$115 million for its maintenance and operations.

Thus, the Appropriations Committee in its report indicates that a total of \$1,043,724,000 in existing appropriations can be transferred to the military departments to meet the needs for the specific appropriations needed in the second supplemental appropriations bill.

Now, it is my understanding from reading the report, that if differences arise as to the sources of needed transfers, the services will be given some flexibility, but any adjustments in the recommended transfers must be absolutely

necessary and must be cleared with the Appropriations Committee before they are made effective.

I am assuming, therefore, that the latitude provided by the report, as well as the language of the bill itself, will give the Department of Defense some opportunity to interchange the transfer of existing appropriations. I am quite convinced that without this flexibility, the Department of Defense may well have a very difficult time in effecting these transfers, for it may develop that the preliminary estimates of potential transfers are wrong and other sources may have to be tapped.

I am advised that the Department of Defense probably can find the needed \$1,200,000,000 in transfers without affecting the national security.

Now that is what makes up the main portions of the supplemental bill insofar as it deals with the Department of Defense. When the gentleman from Missouri said it was not a Truman budget, he was absolutely correct. The reason these items are here is in response to roll-call votes on bills that were passed by the House. When the bill now under consideration came before the Committee on Appropriations, they decided, after most careful investigation, that if permission was given for the transfer of certain funds within the various Departments, that the expenditures necessitated by these four bills could be absorbed out of what was appropriated in 1953. Mr. Chairman, I hope their views can be carried out. I hope it will be possible to absorb this large amount. But let us not fool ourselves. Here is a billion-one-hundred-million-odd dollars which has to be absorbed out of these appropriations. If it can be done, fine. I hope it can be done, but, if it cannot, why we will be confronted here with a deficiency appropriation and not a supplemental appropriation. It certainly is worth while to see if it can be done. If it can be absorbed, it should be absorbed. But, if it cannot be absorbed, then later we obviously will be required to make direct appropriations to carry out these authorizations. But it is worth while giving it an honest trial. For that reason, I am supporting wholeheartedly the committee's position with reference to the transfer of the money from existing appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat intrigued by the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, minority ranking member of the Military Subcommittee on Appropriations and the followup made by the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

I think a careful and somewhat unbiased analysis of whether or not this is the consideration of the Truman budget, at least as far as the military is concerned, would reveal several important factors which I believe effectively indi-

cate that we are considering a Truman budget.

First. If you go down the list of the statutes causing the money requests in this bill you will find, I think, in the hearings before the respective legislative committees that in most cases the legislation was affirmatively approved or recommended by the previous administration. Let us take them one by one.

As to the increase in military pay, I think President Truman sent a favorable message to the 82d Congress and I believe his spokesmen came before the Committee on Armed Services advocating the enactment of a military pay-increase bill.

Second. I believe the only exception is the combat-duty pay. It is my recollection that the Department of Defense, speaking for President Truman, went on record before the Committee on Armed Services opposed to combat-duty pay.

Third. As to the mustering-out payments, it is my recollection that the Bureau of the Budget submitted to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a recommendation for a GI bill which included a mustering-out pay provision.

Fourth. As to uniform allowances, it is my recollection that the previous administration did recommend legislation likewise.

Further, I do not recall any veto by Mr. Truman on any of the aforementioned measures. If he was opposed to them he could have exercised his veto prerogative. Finally, in House Document No. 62, which encompasses all of these supplemental appropriations, the funds themselves were requested by President Truman.

Do not take my previous statements as any indication that Congress should have a clear conscience. I might say, that oftentimes we, the House and the Senate, pretty sadly and rather flagrantly abandon our responsibilities on legislation. I think as to some of the legislation I have mentioned, that the distinguished gentleman from Texas has mentioned, and that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia has mentioned, we should have taken a little more time in their consideration.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. If this administration wants to proceed with a Truman budget rather than work out a budget of its own, I think it certainly has a right to adopt the Truman budget. But my point is, I think Congress, the Members on the Republican side and those on the Democratic side of the House, are entitled to know whether the administration now in power, and the Republican administration is in power in the White House and in Congress, is for or against the budget estimates being considered in this bill. That is the only thing I want to know. The Congress and the country are entitled to know. I am not clear on it. I believe the present administration is for the budget estimates which are before us in this measure, but I cannot actually prove it. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. FORD. As far as I know, but I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I do not know whether or not this budget has been approved by the new administration. I do not think they are objecting to any of the reductions which have been made by the House Committee on Appropriations or any reductions we make on the floor of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. But there is at stake here more than a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money. In the name of forthrightness and good faith should not the administration tell us whether or not it has approved and does approve of this proposed huge expenditure of the taxpayers' money? Should we be left on the sidelines with no information and recommendation from the party now in power?

Mr. FORD. In the Army section alone these four statutes caused President Truman to request an expenditure of \$181,300,000 for pay and allowances; for combat-duty pay \$153,400,000; for mustering-out payments \$373 million; and for uniform allowances \$514 million. A total of \$708,214,000 just for the Army alone as a result of legislation which the preceding Congress approved in the dying days of the last session. I wish to say this in defense of the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense, in my judgment, has cooperated since January 20 in trying to seek the means and methods by which they could absorb some of the added costs which the Congress placed on them in the last session. I hope that attitude on the part of the Department of Defense prevails in the months ahead. I believe it will. With such cooperation by all in the executive branch of the Government, plus real economy efforts by the Congress, I believe a tax-reduction bill can be approved by the House and Senate in this session.

[Mr. BROYHILL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to place myself on record in favor of this bill, and in the language of our eminent colleague from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], it is "worth a trial." If it does not work out, then we will have a deficiency appropriation bill.

I am particularly, however, going to address my remarks to that part of the bill which abolishes \$24 million for schools in impacted areas. This money was appropriated because under Public Law 874 we set up this system of schools. This public law came out of my committee, the Committee on Education and Labor. It so happens that it came out when I was not present, because I was away from Congress on a sick leave of 3 months at that time.

I am against subsidizing with Federal funds, any form of segregation. I want to point out that under Public Law 874 the sons and daughters of Negro men

serving in our Armed Forces are not allowed to go to schools which Federal funds built; that only the sons and daughters of white soldiers and white officers are allowed to go.

Under Public Law 874, there has been a tremendous waste of the taxpayers' money to support separate schools on the basis of race.

When the Atomic Energy Commission began building its Savannah River works project, a number of officials from South Carolina came to Washington to tell the committees of Congress how many thousands of dollars they needed to erect new schools to take care of the children who would come into the area from other places. A few Georgia officials also showed up to make demands on the Federal Treasury.

In reading over the testimony of these people, I was surprised to find the many requests for funds with which to build schools for colored children. The problem of inadequate schools for colored children has been there all of the time, but these State officials apparently decided that while everybody was excited about spending money with which to make the H-bomb it would be a good time to raid the Federal Treasury to do a job that they should have been doing all through the years out of their own State and local taxes.

I have a number of complaints in my office from families of servicemen who are forced to send their children to separate schools outside the military posts, such as Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; Fort Bliss, Tex.; Fort Sill, Okla.; and Fort Belvoir, Va. The people making these complaints are residents of Pennsylvania, New York, and Minnesota. They are serving their country in the armed services, and, as a penalty for such service, they are forced to send their children, who have never previously been exposed to segregation, to schools for colored in the communities surrounding the posts. At all of these forts, there are perfectly good schools on the posts, but they are for the white children only.

The United States Office of Education, under the guidance of the same Mr. B. Alden Lillywhite who appeared before the Appropriations Committee to ask for \$24 million, gives Federal funds to local authorities in the communities near these forts for the purpose of providing segregated school facilities for education of colored children.

Obviously, if we went over Mr. Lillywhite's recommendations with a fine-tooth comb, we would find a great many wasteful expenditures of this kind which are not only bad from an economic point of view but they are also frightful examples of undemocratic treatment of our own citizens at a time when we are trying to sell democracy to the rest of the world. It is bad enough when segregation in schools comes about because of local boards of education, but it is infinitely worse when it is supported by action of the Congress of the United States.

If Mr. Lillywhite had been successful in his plans in 1951, we would be spending even more Federal money for segregation than we now spend because he

participated in a scheme to incorporate language in H. R. 5411 which sounded innocent enough on its face, but which was intended to have the effect of requiring sweeping racial segregation in schools on military posts. Fortunately, President Truman vetoed this bill.

The fundamental question facing Members of this body is simply this: Shall we continue to use tax money collected from the entire country to support a wasteful system of segregation in schools such as those located in Arlington County and nearby Maryland? Mr. Lillywhite's figures show that these schools alone need one-half million dollars. If we assume that this money is to be divided in half for the purpose of providing duplicate buildings, extra teachers, and extra equipment for colored children, it means that we are called upon to take at least a quarter of a million dollars out of the pockets of taxpayers who live in those parts of the country where there is no segregation in schools to pay for racial segregation in Maryland and Virginia.

Only yesterday, the director of the Washington bureau of the NAACP told me about a conference with some local school officials in a defense impacted area of Maryland. The conference was necessary because four colored boys had been refused admission to a trade school which was the only institution in the city offering the particular type of training the children were seeking. The head of the school board said that separate training would be offered for the children and that a whole staff of teachers would be hired, expensive equipment would be purchased, and even a new building would be built if necessary. I am sure that I do not need to tell you who is expected to pay for that kind of waste. It is the people of Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and other States where there is no segregation in public schools who will pay for it in Federal taxes.

Of course, Mr. Lillywhite and the others in the Office of Education, who have his point of view, usually say that the larger part of this money will be spent for building or improving schools for colored children. If that is their argument this time, it only means that they have less justification than ever before for asking for the money. Arlington County and the State of Maryland, as a whole, could get along very nicely on the present State and local tax money appropriated for schools if there was only one school system for all children instead of two school systems that are inferior for both colored and white children.

I believe that we should do everything possible to help out the local communities of this country so that the services provided for United States citizens will be uniformly high in all parts of the country, but I strongly oppose spending New York, Illinois, or New Jersey tax money to support segregated schools in Virginia, Maryland, and South Carolina, or anywhere else.

I am against squandering Federal millions to maintain prejudice and to subsidize segregation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 16 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion on the floor of the House today in regard to this request for an additional \$24 million of Federal funds for the so-called impacted school districts. I wish to pay my respects to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, of the Committee on Rules, for their very courageous, patriotic and pertinent remarks. I think they hit the nail right on the head.

Before we get to that particular item, however, there are some other appropriations requests and the committee's action thereon that should be explained to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I know the gentleman would like to dispose of this inquiry before he enters into a general discussion of private funds for the schools. The Eighty-second Congress, Public Law 411, which was enacted on June 25, 1952, provided that—

The Surgeon General is authorized and directed to make payments to the Board of Health of the Territory of Hawaii for the care and treatment and its facilities of persons afflicted with leprosy at a per diem rate determined from time to time by the Surgeon General.

In a supplemental appropriation bill enacted in June of last year the Congress appropriated \$500,000, and in accordance with the provisions of that law about half of that was allotted to the Territory of Hawaii for the first quarter of the fiscal year and the other half will be exhausted in the second quarter of the fiscal year.

The committee has declined to grant the request of the Public Health Service to provide \$586,000 for the balance of the year. I would like the gentleman to explain why the committee has refused to grant that appropriation in spite of the provisions of the law.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will be very happy to do so.

First, may I say that the reason we have an Appropriations Committee is to look over appropriation authorizations. If the Congress had intended legislative committees to make the appropriations it would not have established an Appropriations Committee. I know that the gentleman from Hawaii is very interested in this subject. He has talked to me about it at length, and I think he knows that I am very sympathetic to the problems of the Territory of Hawaii, for which he is the Delegate. I also am glad to state that he does an exceptionally fine job in representing the Territory of Hawaii.

Congress considered this item in the closing days of the 82d Congress, and it was the judgment of the Congress at that time that \$500,000 be appropriated for the fiscal year 1953. We took the attitude that the Congress had spoken,

and this request in reality was not a supplemental appropriation, but just a request for funds Congress had previously denied.

The Territory of Hawaii is in a different position than is the Federal hospital at Carville in Louisiana because the Carville hospital has been in operation for many, many years as a Federal institution. We thought when the \$500,000 was appropriated that, at least, was \$500,000 more than the Territory of Hawaii had ever had contributed to the upkeep of its hospital. We shall consider the whole matter again when the appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 is before our committee.

I say again that I am very sympathetic to the gentleman's position, but I am still cognizant of the responsibility that an appropriations committee has, and sometimes we have to do things which hurt us, even if it is against the wishes of our very best friends.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to take up a few of the other Labor, Federal Security items before us.

The first item in the report is \$206,000 for salaries and expenses that the Department of Labor requested under the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, which was passed in the closing days of the 82d Congress. I am sure that they can get by on less than \$206,000, but let us assume they actually needed \$206,000 for this extra work. \$206,000 is approximately 4 percent of the nearly \$5 million that has already been appropriated for salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Employment Security. The committee took the attitude that the Department of Labor was well able to absorb an additional 4 percent workload. I might say that if some of these agencies of government do not think they can absorb 4 percent, they had better start changing their thinking because a lot of these agencies will have to take cuts far in excess of 4 percent. So, we did not think it was asking too much of the Department of Labor to do this work with available funds.

The next item is grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration, which was also due to the same act. The request was for \$8,750,000 and the committee, in its judgment, allowed them \$6,750,000. We think that will take care of the program in very good shape because this new program is so closely integrated with the program they are already administering under other laws.

Under grants for unemployment compensation for veterans the original estimate was for \$32,200,000 but they agreed that they could get along with four or five million dollars less than they had asked in their original request.

The bill includes \$150,000 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Every Member of the House knows there has been quite a bit of discussion in both labor and business circles in this country regarding the revision in the Consumer's Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. They started publishing the revised index as of January of this year. Due to the fact that many wage contracts are tied to the old Consumer's

Price Index, we agreed with the executive branch of the Government that if we cut off the old index and published only the revised index, a great deal of difficulty could arise that might lead to some very serious strikes in this country. Rather than take this chance we approved \$150,000 to continue the old index for 6 months. One hundred thousand dollars of the \$150,000 will be transferred from the Wage Stabilization Board, and the remaining \$50,000 from funds previously appropriated for the Mexican farm-labor program.

The next item is salaries and expenses for the Office of Education. I am frank to admit that this item has given me a great deal of concern and there is a very honest difference of opinion on what should be done on this particular item. I sincerely respect those views that do not coincide with my own. Our committee believes that the Office of Education has gone far beyond what was intended under the law. Even if we are wrong in our position in eliminating this item I would like to report to the House that the original justification allowed by the Bureau of the Budget was \$380,000. Then they felt that they could get along with \$289,000 for 55 positions. When they came before our committee, they thought they could get along with \$259,000. After I spent all last Friday afternoon at the Office of Education they agreed that they could get along with \$228,000 to carry out the functions they believe to belong in the Office of Education under the law. However, I am of the opinion that the Office of Education has assumed responsibilities far beyond the intent of the law.

The real controversy appears to be on the next item, which is \$24 million for payments to school districts under Public Law 874. Last year the request for 1953 was \$40 million. That amount was allowed and is available in payments to schools. The school districts that participate in this program were advised of the situation by a letter, a copy of which you will find on page 289 of the hearings. This letter was from the Commissioner of Education, Earl J. McGrath, to all of the school districts throughout the United States that had entitlements under this act. The nub of the letter is contained in one sentence down toward the latter part of the page, where he said to the school districts:

There is no indication at this time that a supplemental request for funds for fiscal year 1953 for payments under Public Law 874 will be entertained by the Bureau of the Budget or considered by the Congress.

I think that is pretty plain language. The school districts were put on notice not to expect any additional funds. In other words they were given notice so that they could plan accordingly.

What is the situation as compared with World War II? During World War II we spent \$67,738,108 over a 9-year period under the Lanham Act. At no time did they have as many as 500 school districts in this program during the war.

At the present time they have expanded this program under the police action of Korea to where 2,300 school districts are participating in this pro-

gram. To give you an idea how this thing has expanded and gotten out of hand, at the peak year 1944-45 under the Lanham Act only \$13,812,000 was spent for maintenance and operations of schools.

Some people have accused me of being against education. I want it understood that I yield to no man in this House in wanting to see the children of our country adequately housed in school buildings and properly educated. But what is the situation? I want you gentlemen that represent city districts to know that 15 of the largest cities of our country, representing a population of 22,520,978, cannot receive one single penny of this appropriation.

These fifteen cities represent only a small percentage of all the cities that have had a tremendous impact on their communities due to the defense program but receive no Federal funds under this appropriation. If that is not discrimination, I do not know what is.

The cities referred to are as follows:
Population, according to the U. S. Census Bureau, April 1, 1950

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Baltimore----- | 949,708 |
| Boston----- | 801,444 |
| Chicago----- | 3,620,962 |
| Cincinnati----- | 503,998 |
| Cleveland----- | 714,809 |
| Detroit----- | 1,849,568 |
| Houston----- | 596,163 |
| Memphis----- | 396,000 |
| Minneapolis----- | 521,718 |
| New Orleans----- | 570,445 |
| New York City----- | 9,891,957 |
| Philadelphia----- | 2,071,605 |
| Portland----- | 373,628 |
| St. Louis----- | 856,796 |
| Washington, D. C.----- | 802,178 |
| Total----- | 22,520,978 |

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] made a very fine statement regarding the situation in Arlington. I only used Arlington in the hearings to illustrate a point, because it was close to Washington and every Member of Congress is familiar with the fact that it is an outstanding community. In addition Arlington claims to have one of the best school systems and the highest income per family in the United States.

The assessed valuation of the property in Arlington County in July 1949 was \$143,185,052. In June 1952 it was \$272,097,571. There are such districts as Savannah, Paducah, and others that are 100 percent federally impacted districts, which should be taken care of, and I would support legislation to do so.

If Arlington County should receive 100 percent of its calculated entitlements, it would only amount to a little over \$2 per person, and I sincerely believe that the people of Arlington County are patriotic enough to sacrifice this small amount in order to stand on their own feet and not look to the Federal Government for assistance. There are many other areas in the United States participating in this program which are in a similar situation.

The Members of Congress clamoring for this additional appropriation of \$24 million remind me of the situation that is familiar to each and every one of us. We receive hundreds of letters in the course of a year from our constituents crying to the high heavens to reduce the

budget and to cut appropriations on everything and everybody, except when it affects them personally.

If we are going to be consistent and fulfill our campaign promises of balancing the budget and voting for economy, the membership of this House will join with the committee in its stand to disallow this \$24 million supplemental request.

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, and also to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, after much thought and consideration, I have drafted and have introduced today a standby control bill, which in my opinion is an absolute necessity. In the light of the present tense international situation, we cannot afford to gamble with the economic security and well-being of this Nation. In the event of a worsening of the international situation or in the event of a sharp price rise, the President should be authorized to act speedily and definitely to halt the ravages of any further inflation.

The purpose of the bill which I introduced is to provide the President with adequate powers to meet any threat to the economic stability or security of the Nation, whether arising out of any new or expanded acts of aggression or otherwise.

It authorizes the President, upon a finding and declaration of the existence of a threat to the economic stability or security of the United States, to issue a general freeze order applicable to prices, rents, and earnings, which shall be effective for a period of 90 days. Where some system of partial controls is already effective, as may be the case with State or Federal rent controls, the general freeze would prevent upward adjustments otherwise authorized for a period of 90 days. It has been the experience of this country, in World War I, World War II, and since the 1950 aggression of the North Koreans, that the greatest price inflation swiftly follows any new crisis or emergency. It has been during these periods, however, that the Nation has been most unprepared to meet the menace of inflation.

Under normal circumstances the free market and collective bargaining is the fairest and most efficient way of determining prices and wages. When crises suddenly develop, direct price and wage controls can perform a holding operation which neither the market nor other types of controls can meet.

The bill would make it possible to invoke such direct controls in the simplest and most direct form. The President need not consult with Congress or with any advisory body as a condition precedent to the issuance of a general freeze order. He need only find and declare

that a threat to the economic stability or security of the United States is threatened or exists. This places the responsibility for the initiation of such controls with our Chief Executive, the same person to whom the Constitution entrusts the conduct of foreign affairs, to wit: the President of the United States.

By this bill, however, Congress does not abandon its responsibility to legislate for the common defense and the general welfare. Within the 90-day period in which the general freeze shall be effective, Congress may do 1 of 4 things: First, it may continue the general freeze and establish a date for its termination; second, it may terminate such freeze forthwith; third, it may, after due consideration, enact further legislation; or, fourth, it may decide that such controls should be abandoned after the termination of the general freeze and therefore decline to enact any further legislation.

The enactment of this bill would assure that Congress would consider any subsequent stabilization legislation calmly and deliberately. The 90-day freeze would provide a setting in which sellers could not complain of discrimination, since their ceilings under the freeze would mirror the market sometime during the 1-month base period which the President may employ in the freeze. It is for this reason that the present bill contains no special provision for any group in the economy which would operate to upset price, rent, or wage relationships established by the freeze order. More significantly, Congress would be able to consider further legislation without the pressures which arise when costs and prices are rapidly increasing. It avoids the necessity of considering the difficult problems of rollbacks.

Several provisions have been omitted from the present bill which one might expect to find in more comprehensive legislation. However, appropriate provision is made for the delegation of Presidential authority to agencies he may continue or create, except that he cannot delegate the responsibility of finding and declaring a threat to the economic stability or security of the United States which requires the use of the general freeze order authorized by this bill.

In order that the general freeze order may be effectively enforced, the bill contains the same sanctions that appear in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. The bill also contains necessary provisions for the administration of the act, it authorizes the making of appropriations and continues the Joint Committee on Defense Production in its present form. The authority contained in the bill would terminate automatically 90 days after the issuance of the general freeze order. It does not permit the President to perpetuate controls by successive 90-day freeze orders.

Under the bill the tragic upswing in prices occurring during the 8 months following the outbreak of the Korean conflict could not recur providing the President employs the powers which this bill grants. Within a few hours of the

Presidential declaration of a threat to our economic stability or security, a complete freeze of the economy could be placed into effect.

Instead of waiting for congressional action subsequent to an emergency, the bill lays the groundwork for the protection of our economic system well in advance of war-born emergencies which may threaten it. Once the forces of runaway inflation are in motion, it is much too late to then seek from Congress the necessary Executive power to stem those forces.

The Communist attack came on June 25. It took Congress until September 8 to enact a price-wage bill. This law was cumbersome and needlessly complicated. It required the President to try voluntary controls before he would resort to genuine price control. As a result it was February 1951 before the upward spiral of prices had been brought to a temporary halt. By that time, wholesale prices had gone up 16 percent and the consumer's price index had risen 8 percent. Thus, in the short space of 8 months, the consumers of this country suffered a loss of \$16 billion—all because there was no standby authority to impose a price-wage freeze.

The delay had an even more serious result; not only did prices soar during the post-Korea panic-buying wave—they advanced unevenly, so that when the general price freeze was imposed, some prices had doubled while others had only risen slightly. This got us into the complicated problem of price rollbacks, and led us, eventually, to the Capehart amendment.

A third harmful result of the price rise, of course, was the immense increase in our defense budget by price rises of defense items. The Defense Department was required to pay from 50 to 150 percent more for many of the standard items it bought. One item went up 610 percent. Our defense appropriations were in fact dissipated by excessive costs and prices because of the failure to freeze them in June or July of 1950.

These facts should not have been forgotten so soon. The international situation is still so precarious that we cannot afford to leave the President without authority to protect the consumers and taxpayers of this country against another crisis that would send prices soaring.

It is most apropos that I direct the attention of the Congress to the findings of the American Assembly, held at Columbia University on December 5 to 7, 1952. The purpose of the assembly was a reappraisal of inflation. Part of the records of the assembly is an interesting letter from President Dwight D. Eisenhower to Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, chairman of the National Policy Board, which was read in his absence by Dean Philip Young, dean of the Graduate School of Business of Columbia University, and executive director of the American Assembly. I quote in part from that letter from President Eisenhower:

You will recall my saying at the time of its establishment that the American Assembly was perhaps the most important step I had taken during my presidency of Co-

lumbia University. My experiences at SHAPE, and more recently in the United States, have convinced me that the work of the American Assembly is needed more than ever.

The American Assembly must continue to furnish our citizens and our Government with objective facts, findings, and practical courses of action in dealing with vital United States problems. I am sure that, with the support and enthusiasm of public-spirited individuals and organizations, its growth will continue.

You will recall the discussions that you, Dean Young, and I have had on Morning-side Heights and at SHAPE. With the other members of the National Policy Board, we have always felt that the assembly was based on two principles:

(1) That free citizens can make up their own minds on public questions if they have access to sound, unbiased facts; and

(2) That the practice of democracy demands individual sacrifice, particularly in reconciling divergent views in order to accomplish a common purpose.

I am sure neither President Eisenhower nor this Congress should consider for even one moment, ignoring the most important finding of that assembly. I quote to you from the summary report of those findings the following:

DIRECT CONTROLS

On the question of direct controls, it was agreed that price and wage ceilings should be removed but that stand-by authority to impose controls should be provided.

This bill accomplishes that recommendation and nothing more. It should be enacted promptly.

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call to the attention of the House of Representatives an event of political importance which occurred in Philadelphia this week.

The Democratic City Committee on Monday elected as its new chairman our esteemed colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Representative of the Fifth Pennsylvania District.

Mr. GREEN was chosen city chairman by unanimous action of the committee members.

This was a well-merited tribute by the rank and file of the Democratic Party to one who has labored long and earnestly in its behalf and for the humanitarian principles for which the party stands.

Alone among the great cities of our Nation, Philadelphia last November stood rock-ribbed in its adherence to the Democratic Party, returning a majority of 150,000 for the entire ticket.

In 1951 Philadelphia for the first time in 67 years elected a Democratic mayor, Joseph S. Clark, Jr., and a Democratic district attorney, Richardson Dilworth.

Congressman GREEN's election as city chairman is a happy choice. His warm personality and friendly spirit, of which you all know, should harmonize all elements of the party and assure its success in future elections.

In honoring one of our Members with this position of distinction, the Democratic Party of Philadelphia has honored the United States House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

Furniture: For an additional amount for "Furniture," \$58,750, to remain available until June 30, 1954, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation, "Contingent expenses, House of Representatives, furniture, 1952," is hereby made available until June 30, 1954.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out the words "Furniture: For an additional amount for 'Furniture', \$58,750, to remain available until June 30, 1954, and."

[Mr. SIKES addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This is the housekeeping part of this bill. The Clerk of the House appeared before the subcommittee and told us—and he has a responsibility—that he needed these funds to properly supply Members of this House with this furniture. I do not want to belabor this committee longer on this item. I wish we could vote on it.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much money was required to modernize the House Chamber and the Chamber of the other body. It seemed to me that the chairs we had before the renovation were very comfortable; in any event, it was determined to change the whole works. No question was raised regarding that and I am sure the cost ran into the millions.

This country wants Congressmen with backbone. My medical friends both inside and outside the AMA tell me that the best way to acquire a backbone if you do not have one or to retain it if you do is to stand up straight whenever you are sitting down. There is no sense in using the fine, comfortable 1953 model chairs we have in the House Chamber a few hours daily if we must go back to offices equipped with 1853 horsehair torture chairs.

I think the country will receive a net gain in service with these good chairs instead of those a few dollars cheaper. Far more expensive legislation will be passed by back-weary Congressmen who cannot stand up to pressure groups because they can scarcely stand up at all than by the fine specimen of upstanding Congressmen whose backs are modeled of orthopedic virtue.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman think this amendment would have been offered if some newspaper had not written about it?

Mr. BENDER. I do not think so. You hit the nail on the head.

While we are discussing corrective measures for the Capitol and House

Office Buildings, I wish someone would offer an amendment to spend \$50,000 or whatever amount is required to get the cockroaches out of this building and the New and Old House Office Buildings. These pests become so numerous at times that we should take drastic steps to exterminate them. And while we are doing a clean-up job let us not overlook the restaurant downstairs.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he feels that he needs one of these new chairs; is that right?

Mr. BENDER. I am satisfied with my chair.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. There was one of the constituents of a certain Congressman who came up and looked over his office and the things up here, and he said: "Well, it's better than you're used to."

Mr. BENDER. It is possible that we have one or two Members answering that description.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I say to the gentleman who just sat down that we are not used to cockroaches where I come from.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BENDER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not think anyone in this House or in America can accuse me of wasting the taxpayers' money, but I do want to point out that my very good friend, our very fine colleague and great Representative from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has already secured the new chairs for his subcommittee. He got them last year and made no objection at that time, as far as I know. Did you?

Mr. SIKES. I do not sit in them because I do not like them.

Mr. BENDER. He has the right to reject them.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. In all seriousness, I think any Member is entitled to any kind of a chair he wants within the bounds of reason. However, there are some of us who prefer those old chairs, and we do not want these new ones to be inflicted upon us. I wonder if it would not be wise for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] to modify his amendment, cutting it in half, so that those of us who want the old ones may have them and those who want the new ones may also have them?

Mr. BENDER. As far as I am concerned, if you want to sit on the floor that is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I heard it suggested by someone on a streetcar today that we ought to have beds over here instead of chairs. I do not approve of that suggestion, but I just pass it on to the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. If there is any Member of Congress who requires a bed instead of a chair, then his constituents should retire him, but I resent any implication on the part of anyone that we do not work here.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. Is there any truth in the report I hear that those boys who want these high back chairs all have weak backs?

Mr. BENDER. Maybe the gentleman has something there.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIKES) there were—ayes 42, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while we are talking about appropriations and taxes and a desire to balance the budget, I want to call to the attention of the House a resolution that I introduced today on a more or less kindred subject. As a matter of fact, I think that all Members of the House realize that if we are going to balance the budget this year help in that direction must come through savings in our defense program at home, wherever we can save, and in our defense program abroad.

Now, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, in fact, the whole legislative body, has been interested in this question of an integrated armed force in Europe. Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State under the present administration, has said recently in a speech that nothing that the United States can do can offer Europe a sound defense if Europe is divided and continues to be divided into many national camps pulling against each other. I want to call to the attention of the House that since the inception of our foreign-aid program in 1948 this program has been, in fact, a bipartisan program. In 1948 when the Marshall plan was first inaugurated the Republican Party was in control of the Congress, and we had a democratic President, and we went along hand in hand, both Democrats and Republicans, in the realization that if we were to save this world from communism we had to stand together in helping to build up Europe economically. In that first act, and since that first act, there has been a chain of legislative expression in every act for foreign aid which I wish to emphasize today. In the Marshall Plan

Act, the act of 1948, we said that this act is "to encourage economic cooperation in Europe which is essential for lasting peace." In the ECA Act of 1949 we said it was "to encourage unification of Europe." In the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950 we asserted that it was "to encourage the further unification of Europe." In the Mutual Security Act of 1951 we asserted our proposal "to further encourage the economic unification and political federation of Europe." And last year, in the 1952 Mutual Security Act, we spelled out the admonition that "this act should be so administered as to support concrete measures for political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe."

My resolution, Mr. Chairman, reads:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in a spirit of friendly cooperation it is the sense of the Congress that progress during the past 5 years should soon culminate in the establishment of a strong, unified armed force for the common defense of the free nations of Europe. The Congress reaffirms its previous bipartisan declarations concerning the need for military integration and economic unification in Europe, and supports efforts to speed the attainment of these objectives.

Mr. Chairman, it will not be long, I imagine, before this administration will come up here with a foreign military-aid program.

I am one of those who have supported this program from its inception but I am one of those who realize that unless there is unification in Europe, military integration of the armed forces in Europe, which the present administration is trying to accomplish and which the preceding administration tried to accomplish, the money we send over there will be sent in vain. This is no effort to dictate to Europe, this is just a recapitulation and a reassertion of what has been the basis of our program from the legislative angle and what the Congress thinks it has a legitimate right to expect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It also shows that both parties here are in support of as early a unification in Europe as is possible. It represents leadership on the part of the Democratic Party to reestablish the bipartisan support which is so necessary for the best interests of our country, which some individuals, not talking for the present administration but in prominent positions in the present administration, have unfortunately shattered to some extent. This shows that this policy represents the policy of both parties in the Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

(On request of Mr. VORYS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RICHARDS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. RICHARDS. Before yielding to the gentleman from Ohio, may I say that my purpose here is a reaffirmation of a bipartisan foreign policy, and to show that the minority here is behind the

efforts now being made to bring about military integration in Europe.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. While I have had no opportunity to read the gentleman's resolution, just from what I have heard I would like to say a loud "amen," and commend the gentleman for his reaffirmation of a policy that has had continued bipartisan support. I do not know what action will be or should be taken on this resolution, but its mere introduction will help to give a timely, temperate, and solemn reminder to our European friends, It is your move.

The gentleman well knows that during the past 5 years the House of Representatives and its Committee on Foreign Affairs have been ahead of the State Department in our continued and insistent encouragement of European unity, and my friend from South Carolina has been in the forefront in those efforts. Each year, beginning in the Republican 80th Congress, our committee wanted stronger words than the State Department wanted in there, but the State Department was timid about attempting to urge too strongly, and each time until last year we had problems in conference with the other body on such language. However, last year, as the gentleman reminds us, Congress laid it on the line; we said we wanted concrete steps toward European federation, and soon.

When Secretary Dulles went over there, and was accused of giving them a 75-day ultimatum, all he was doing was reminding them of the facts of life here in the United States and in Congress, which the gentleman from South Carolina has summed up, as far as I have been able to follow him, in a very good way. All the gentleman is doing, all Secretary Dulles is doing, all the House has done repeatedly and increasingly for 5 years, is to remind Europe of what wise European leading statesmen are saying: that a divided Europe cannot make the grade in peace or war, and that time is of the essence of their salvation.

I congratulate the gentleman on doing his part in reaffirming this policy, laid down by our President and the Secretary of State, based on repeated bipartisan declarations by Congress.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman. Much of the language I have quoted here, was included in the legislation mentioned upon the very strong insistence of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the ranking minority member of our Foreign Affairs Committee and the former chairman of that committee for his bipartisan action in introducing this resolution.

A resolution calling for bipartisan action in matters of foreign policy and especially such a resolution coming from the minority side of this House shows very clearly that we stand united in mutual defense efforts for ourselves and our free democratic allies throughout the world.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] in his usual fine spirit of understanding and cooperation is again through the introduction of his resolution calling for the continuation of united action on the international front. He is also pledging minority support for free world strength and mutual cooperation.

The minority leader of our committee is again visibly and forcibly expressing the conviction of a vast majority of the members on our side of the aisle that our country as the leader of the free world must stand united in our dealings with all our allies in the present threat to our security.

Surely every Member of this House must be thoroughly convinced that division among us must end at the water edge. We Democrats now in the minority still feel and act as we did in the majority in international issues. We urge our own united action in cooperation with the united action of our allies. The adoption of this concurrent resolution will not be welcome news to our enemies. However, further constructive action must of necessity await positive steps from the new administration.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think this show of bipartisan support is the most hopeful sign that we can give to Europe. As the ranking Member has said, we are not dictating but we are expressing the firm hope as we have before that this will come about. Certainly the operation of the Schuman plan, which began 2 or 3 weeks ago, is already proving that things like this can be done. I think it will strike fear into the hearts of our enemy and bring hope to the hearts of free men throughout the world. It shows that we are sincerely trying through good will and through help as far as we can to show that this country is not divided in its efforts to build up a strong, free Western Europe. I certainly commend the gentleman for his resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I too want to commend the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, for introducing his bipartisan resolution.

Such a resolution is in keeping with our bipartisan foreign policy which has been so forcibly advanced since the end of World War II. We on the minority side of the aisle who furnished leadership for nonpartisan free world coordination while we were in the majority, now continue our support for the same kind of bipartisan action.

It is heartening to see the leadership on our side of the aisle, still urging and pledging bipartisan support to the efforts to unite and strengthen the free world. We of the minority, stand ready and await the opportunity to support the efforts of the present administration to

further unite and strengthen the free world in our mutual fight for survival. We sincerely trust that the new leadership will continue a definite constructive course and will make known precisely just what they have in mind. You are carrying the ball now. We want to help strengthen the line.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of announcing to the House that the Committee To Investigate the Justice Department will hold an open hearing at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning on the matter presented to the House this morning by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. We will hear Mr. POWELL as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and also any other Member of the House who would like to be heard on that subject. The hearing will be in the room of the Judiciary Committee tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, and will be open to the public. Further hearings will be held next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize as strongly as possible the importance of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. The very fact that it comes from the Democratic side and the very fact that the gentleman who introduced it is a ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shows that we are united in this effort. I might say that the resolution was introduced as a result of a number of conferences between the leadership on the Democratic side and the members on the Democratic side on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. We feel that the present administration can go forward with its best foot if in connection with foreign affairs, there is a bipartisan condition existing not only in words but in action and in deed. This resolution, if it should be adopted by the House and the other body in concurrence, would convey to the entire world that both parties in Congress are in support of the administration in the attempt to bring about the military unification of Europe as quickly as possible and that we are doing it in a friendly spirit of cooperation. I am sure our Republican friends welcome this resolution coming from the Democratic Party because it will have world-wide significance, coming as it does from the minority party than if it came from the majority party.

I am not minimizing its significance if it came from the majority party. We want bipartisan thought and action in connection with foreign affairs. It is coming in this case by concrete action from the Democratic Party. There are other things that will bring about bipartisan policy. Other actions are going to be necessary. There must be a refraining from public misinformation as to foreign affairs conducted under the

Democratic administrations. The unfortunate statement in the message on the state of the Union about lifting the Formosa blockade, and creating the impression, unintentionally I am sure, that the Truman order was protecting the Communists on the China mainland, cannot be repeated, because we are not going to take that. That is not conducive to bipartisan efforts. We on the Democratic side, but I frankly state, purely from a personal standpoint, do not intend to take that. You cannot expect to produce bipartisanship and insult the truths of history.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman brought out the point I wanted to bring out. I was wondering if the gentleman, interested as he is in promoting real true bipartisanship in our foreign policy, does not think that the administration should not echo these falsehoods which are hindering the success of such a program.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question about that. I am sure their utterance does not represent the views of a majority of the Republicans, but this is a time when we should all be patient and tolerant, because to do so is in the interest of America, which is greater than our affiliation with any political party.

This particular resolution is introduced for the purpose of repairing any damage that has been done, but there is a responsibility on the majority side. In fact, the leadership must come from the majority side. I hope the introduction of this resolution is evaluated in its full and complete light, because it is constructive, and has more effect coming from the minority than if it had come from the majority. Its significance abroad will be far reaching, because it shows unity of thought and unity of action by both parties in the Congress of the United States in relation to our foreign affairs.

My purpose is to convey the importance of this resolution coming from the Democratic side, and the importance of the message it will convey to the entire world, if adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say, apropos of what has been said by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], if what we have had in the last 4 years under Dean Acheson was a bipartisan foreign policy, then the Lord deliver us from any further bipartisan foreign policy.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to address an inquiry to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. It now becomes evident we cannot conclude this bill to-

night. I was wondering if the gentleman from New York had in mind to let the remainder of the bill go over until tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. I had hoped to move that the Committee rise when we came to the Federal Security Agency, but the way it has been drifting the last few minutes, perhaps we ought to rise when we get through with this chapter. I think that will not take too long.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read down to and including line 9 on page 3.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOURLY OF MEETING, FEBRUARY 19

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, might I suggest, and to include extraneous matter?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROPOSAL

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

RESTORE THE VETERANS' \$5,000,000

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

(OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued Feb. 20, 1953
For actions of Feb. 19, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 28

CONTENTS

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|----|----------------------|----|----------------------------|---|
| Adjournment..... | 4 | Education..... | 1 | Labor, farm..... | 5 |
| Administrative agencies.. | 13 | Electrification..... | 12 | Personnel..... | 7 |
| Alaska..... | 11 | Farm prices..... | 2 | St. Lawrence waterway..... | 6 |
| Appropriations..... | 1 | Forestry..... | 1 | Taxation..... | 1 |
| Bonding employees..... | 8 | Housing..... | 3 | Transportation..... | 9 |
| Dairy industry..... | 10 | | | | |

HOUSE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Passed with amendment, 369-2, this bill, H. R. 3053 (pp. 1282-1329). Agreed, 197-18, to a Fogarty amendment providing \$20,500,000 for education in areas where large percentages of Federal employees reside (pp. 1290-1310). Rep. Angell, Oreg., spoke in favor of payments in lieu of taxes on Federal lands and inserted a Farm Journal article, "New Land for the West? -- Stockmen Are Offering a Bill Intended to End Their Fight with the Forest Service" (pp. 1284-5).
2. FARM PRICES. Rep. Lyle spoke in favor of parity prices for farmers (pp. 1281-2). Rep. Williams of Miss. also spoke on this subject, but his remarks did not appear in this issue of the Record (p. 1330).
3. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment H. J. Res. 160, to increase the title I loan-insurance authorization of FIA from \$1,250,000,000 to \$1,750,000,000 (H. Rept. 78)(pp. 1331, D82).
4. ADJOURNED until Mon., Feb. 23 (p. 1331). Next week's program, as announced by Majority Leader Halleck: Mon., reading of Washington's farewell address; Tues., resolutions to finance committee investigations; Wed., military personnel review and, if a rule is granted, the housing bill (p. 1329).

BILLS INTRODUCED

5. FARM LABOR. H. R. 3304, by Rep. McMahon, to provide that Federal legislation which prohibits the employment of children during certain hours shall not apply with respect to the harvesting of basic agricultural commodities; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 1332).
6. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. H. R. 3319, by Rep. Zablocki, to authorize this project; to Public Works Committee (p. 1332).
7. PERSONNEL. H. R. 3321, by Rep. Morrison, to provide for a pay increase for Government employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 1332).
H. R. 3299, by Rep. Javits, to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 1331).

H. R. 3301, by Rep. Karsten, to deny benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to persons convicted of felonies involving improper use of their authority, power, influence, or privileges as Government officers or employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 1331).

8. BONDING OF EMPLOYEES. H. R. 3302, by Rep. Karsten, to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to Government Operations Committee (p. 1331).

9. TRANSPORTATION. H. R. 3288, by Rep. Aspinall, to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 1331).

H. R. 3290, by Rep. Aspinall, to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the U. S. Government for its employees; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 1331).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

10. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Laird inserted a Hoard's Dairyman editorial discussing the problem of falling dairy prices (p. A796).

11. ALASKA. Rep. Bartlett inserted a San Jose News article asserting that Rev. Bernard Hubbard, the "glacier priest," was now in favor of statehood for Alaska (pp. A815-16).

12. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Jones (Ala.) inserted a Florence Times editorial claiming that the industrial growth of the Tennessee Valley will be frozen if the Administration fails to provide sufficient funds to continue to increase TVA power capacity (p. A816).

13. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES. Rep. Staggers inserted an article in the Journal of the D. C. Bar Association discussing the problem of how far administrative agencies may go in setting up rules and regulations in carrying out a broad congressional mandate (pp. 818-20).

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR FEB. 20: H. Agriculture (exec), Livestock Subcommittee.

-0-

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105-A.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 99

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1953

No. 28

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, February 20, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Billy Graham, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, we come into Thy presence today with a sense of awe at Thy greatness because Thou art the God of creation, Thou art the God of might and Thou art also the God of goodness and love, of grace, and of mercy. We come to Thee today thanking Thee as Thy creatures for all the great blessings that Thou hast bestowed upon this great Nation. We thank Thee for the great freedoms that we possess when other nations do not have such freedoms. We thank Thee for freedom of the press, for freedom of speech, and for freedom of religion. But, our Father, we have been a sinful nation, and we confess our sins of materialism, our sins of behaviorism, our sins of humanism. We confess our sins of commercialism, our sins of pride, our sins of immorality, our sins of neglect of the church and of the Bible and of God. We humble ourselves in Thy presence today. We pray for our President and his Cabinet. We pray for our Armed Forces, especially those men in Korea. We wouldst remember those men that lie on hospital beds today; some of them that will never walk again, some that will never see again, some that will never enjoy life again, because they have paid the supreme sacrifice for this horrible conflict in Korea. We pray today, our Father, for the Congress. We pray that Thou wouldst give wisdom; we pray that Thou wouldst give moral courage rather than political expediency. We pray that Thou wouldst give us the capacity to be big men in this terrible and dark hour in which we live. We pray that this day above all else will be a day when all of us are conscious of the leading of Thy holy spirit and that every one of us will rest and depend upon Thee in this hour when men are seeking to

destroy themselves by the weapons that they have fashioned. We pray that Thou wouldst give us consolation and bring peace in our time if it be Thy will. We pray for every man individually. Many of us have our own personal problems, our own personal needs, our own inner conflicts. We pray that Thou wouldst give us peace of soul and peace of conscience, inward joy, and a personal relationship with God that will allow us at any time of day to call upon God to be our helper and our strength in the multitude of problems and responsibilities that are ours. We ask in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MALICIOUS CHARGES OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

(Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, an incident was brought to my attention today which indicates a shocking situation to exist within the Government circles here in Washington. A young lady of the colored race who is a resident of my congressional district in New York and presently employed by one of the temporary agencies, reports to me that the White House had made inquiry of her agency for recommendation of three people for employment at the White House as clerk-typist, and that she had been selected to be recommended. Subsequently, after her name had been sent to the White House, she was told that the White House had rejected her for employment upon the basis that she was a colored lady.

I immediately made contact with the White House and learned that not only is there no such policy with respect to racial discrimination in White House

employment but that colored persons are actually presently employed there.

This incident makes the conclusion inescapable that some individuals presently employed by Government agencies who are hostile to the present Chief Executive have deliberately, falsely, and maliciously sought to discredit and undermine the administration by unwarranted misrepresentation and an attempt to arouse racial animosities. It is a shameful and disgraceful performance and one which I feel should be known to the public and that swift and summary action taken against those who are guilty.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD of yesterday. On page 1262, in the second column, delete the words:

Mr. SIKES. I do not sit in them because I do not like them.

And insert the words:

Mr. SIKES. The Subcommittee on Army Appropriations of which I was chairman did not have new chairs, and made no request for them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC STABILITY FOR FARMERS

(Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the economic stability of the farmers of America is not a political issue. Their welfare is the stabilizing influence of our national economy.

The products of the mines, the factories and the shops of our country and to some extent, the world, are produced and sold profitably in proportion to the prosperity of the millions who engage in agricultural pursuits. It is quite foolish to assume that by lowering the income of the farmer and the rancher we may enrich our city cousins.

It has been estimated that for every \$3 billion the farm income declines, a million farm workers will lose their jobs.

The Secretary of Agriculture and all of those of us who hold responsibility must understand that the farmer and the rancher seeks only parity and the basic philosophy behind the farm program which has enriched our Nation is aimed at no other goal except to make the farmer an equal partner in the richness of our economy. So long as minimum wages, hours, and other working conditions are a subject of law, so long as protective tariffs, tax benefits, and other business stimuli are subjects of the law, then so long must the farmer be placed in a position of parity by the law.

It is not and has never been a question of disaster. It is a question of equality. We cannot afford to permit a drastic reduction in farm income, not even if it would result, as Mr. TAFT has indicated, in a Democratic Congress 2 years from now. Such a price for political preferment is too high.

Our lending institutions, our merchants, our manufacturers, yes, all of our Nation must be assured that the purchasing power of the farmer and rancher will be kept at parity with their fellow Americans. Otherwise our economy may retrench to a position that is far from consistent with the requirements of our present age.

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. RODINO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3053, with Mr. ALLEN of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 9 on page 3 of the bill. If there are no amendments to be offered at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Construction," \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to a very serious situation which will result if this body approves the appropriation committee's failure to approve a \$24,000,000 supplemental appropriation for operation and maintenance of schools in federally affected areas under Public Law 874.

My own State of Washington has experienced tremendous expansion in the need for schools and the cost of operating them caused by new population drawn into the various areas by Federal activities. Seventy-four school districts will suffer a total deficit of more than \$1,000,000 in the State of Washington if this supplemental appropriation is not forthcoming. These are all districts which not only have been caused huge additional responsibilities for educating children of families drawn into the districts by Federal activity, but also have suffered substantial tax losses from withdrawal of property from the tax rolls. Most of them already have assumed indebtedness up to the legal limit under the laws of our State.

To many of these districts, there may be no recourse but to close before the end of their terms.

This Congress has a mandate to achieve economy, but not to extinguish the lamps of learning through repudiation of its fair and honest obligations.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the first 3 days of this week I had the great pleasure of going into Texas to make Lincoln Day speeches. In the valley of the Rio Grande, I saw from the air and from the ground the great \$42,000,000 Falcom Dam which is being built there for irrigation, reclamation, and power development. This dam is a most worthy project, because it will add, through irrigation, to the productivity of 500,000 of the most fertile and productive acres in the Nation.

I talked to a great many residents of the Rio Grande Valley, and all of them were enthusiastic about the construction of this dam as a power development and reclamation project. They were uniformly of the opinion that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], who represents that district, has done an exceedingly effective job of calling the necessity of this project to the attention of Congress and in securing funds for its construction. He has worked intelligently and efficiently to bring about that great development.

However, I did find among the people of the Rio Grande Valley great resentment against a proposal of the International Boundary and Water Commission that 47,000 acres of the above-high-water shorelands around the lake, above the dam, be taken and used as a national park. They believed a park of 47,000 acres unnecessarily large and they did not want these 47,000 acres taken off the taxrolls of their local government districts.

I spoke to a Lincoln Day gathering of about 400 people. In that speech, I said I believed that the use of 47,000 acres of land behind that dam for recreational purposes was an unnecessarily large area. I said that if the lands were to be used for recreational areas that the people of Texas themselves should determine what lands were to be used for park purposes and not agencies of the Federal Government. I noted that the 400 people at that meeting loudly applauded this remark, indicating that they wanted to have jurisdiction over their own lands, and not have them dominated by the bureaucrats of the Park Service or the International Boundary and Water Commission.

In the 48 States there are 2,988,000 square miles of territory. At the present time, 711,168 of those square miles are owned by the Federal Government and under Federal bureaucratic management and control. Today, 23.9 percent of all the land in the 48 States of this Nation is owned by the Federal Government and administered and managed by Federal bureaus.

To say it another way, this Federal land owned by the Federal Government and administered by the bureaucrats constitutes an area more than 2½ times the size of the State of Texas, or 10 times the size of the combined area of the combined 6 New England States.

This bureaucratic mania to bring more lands under their domination is not confined to the State of Texas alone. In the State of Washington we have the same condition prevailing along the hundreds of miles of territory on both sides of Roosevelt Lake behind the Grand Coulee Dam.

Nor do we have to go 3,500 miles to the State of Washington or 2,000 miles to Texas to find examples of this land-grabbing mania. Just across the Potomac River adjacent to Arlington Cemetery, there is a tract of 28 acres known as the Nevius tract. The Veterans' Administration wanted to build a hospital for the District of Columbia and insisted the Nevius tract was the only location for it. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] gave figures here last year showing that the Federal Government had paid \$65,000 an acre for the 28 acres in the Nevius tract, or a total of \$1,600,000. Within 5 minutes' automobile drive from that site the VA could have purchased land for \$600 or \$700 an acre.

The Veterans' Administration condemned the Nevius tract land and paid for it with borrowed money which has become part of the national debt. The taxpayers now are paying \$32,000 a year in interest on the money used to purchase the Nevius tract. The Veterans' Administration now has decided that the hospital should be built some place else and the Nevius tract is of no use to the Government. The result is that the Federal Government is paying \$32,000 a year in interest on the money borrowed to buy land for which the Government has no use. Furthermore the city of Alexandria has lost the \$17,600 a year in taxes which was paid on this Nevius tract land when it was in private ownership.

In the State of Washington the Voice of America condemned a tract of land

and paid in excess of \$500,000 for it as a site for a radio station. The Voice had been offered an equally good tract for \$12,000 but insisted on buying the more expensive land for this radio station.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MACK of Washington was given 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Voice of America was offered two sites for their radio station. One site would cost \$12,000. It had no agricultural value. The other site would cost \$500,000, for it consisted of the choicest irrigated agricultural land in the State of Washington. Of course, the aesthetic tastes of the Voice of America people could not be satisfied with a \$12,000 site, so they went ahead and bought 1,200 acres at \$400 to \$500 an acre of this expensive agricultural land for a radio station.

On last Monday, Dr. Compton, who is head of the Voice of America, issued a statement saying that he had recommended that the station should not be built on this site for which the Voice of America had paid \$500,000, but that the station should be moved to southern California and new lands purchased there as a site for it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Did I understand the gentleman to say that for a radio station they had to have a site of 1,200 acres?

Mr. MACK of Washington. At first they wanted 2,400 acres which was the \$12,000 site. Then they selected the 1,200-acre site and paid approximately \$500,000 for it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How much ground does it take for a radio station?

Mr. MACK of Washington. In my opinion it should take about six to eight acres, not 1,200 acres.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What were the Voice of America and the State Department going to raise on this great area of land, pansies?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The theory of the Federal bureaucrats seems to be that they should take land out of use and out of production so that private enterprise can be put out of business.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. I am certainly happy the gentleman is taking the position he is on a vital question that affects not only the great State of Washington but also my own State of Kentucky. The Federal Government has acquired so much land in Kentucky that many of the counties do not have a sufficient tax base to support the government or the local communities. The same is true of the school districts.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The seizure and confiscation of private lands and placing them under Federal control is the thing that has brought about this constant stream of requests to Congress for aid to school districts and other lo-

cal government grants. We are impoverishing the State, county, city, and school governments by these land-seizure practices.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was very much interested in the gentleman's comments about these radio stations, and I am just wondering what happened to the cut I proposed of \$20,000,000 from the Voice of America program last year, pinpointing this very thing we are discussing here. How did they come around and get that money?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The money that was used to purchase this radio station site came out of the appropriation bill for the previous year. I do not believe the Voice would have gotten that money if Congress knew how it would be squandered.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As I recall, that particular station was in question last year.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly indebted to my friend from the State of Washington for his kind comments in regard to my work in representing my district. I do hope he will return soon and often and I may have the pleasure of being there for his next visit.

The particular project to which he has addressed his remarks, the Falcom International Dam on the Rio Grande is one that is now 80 percent completed. I am glad to see that the committee is not indulging in any false economy on this particular project. The Falcom Dam is guaranteed for completion by our Government by November of 1953 through a treaty with Mexico. With this appropriation the ultimate completion will be expedited. This appropriation will assure us of not losing priorities on steel and materials that were needed for its construction, priorities we would have lost had we not had the appropriation at this time. If we had delayed the appropriation we would have merely forestalled meeting our obligation, we would have broken faith with the Mexican Government. It will benefit an area which is tremendously productive but is experiencing one of the greatest droughts in history at the present time. We would have left it without income because of crop failures due to lack of water. Additional tax loss would have accrued to the government by delaying construction. We would have had a starting and stopping of construction which would have resulted in greater cost in contractual obligations.

As to the work of the International Boundary and Water Commission, I am pleased to say they have given us considerable cooperation. They have not given us all that we have requested or that we need for the citizens of Zapata County. Originally they proposed talking considerably more land than they have at the present time. I contacted them and after conferences with the people in the county they agreed to cut down the amount of land they would

take. I am urging that they cut this taking of land to the absolute minimum needed for the lakes protection. They also were going to take all of the gas and oil rights under those lands. I think it is a mistake on the part of the Federal Government to do that. It should not be in the oil and gas business. That is a speculative enterprise. Either you pay the landowner too much for it and the general taxpayer suffers or you pay the landowner too little for it and it is an unfair condemnation of his property. At the present time they tell me a large oil and gas field in that area has been discovered and the land and oil and gas rights will be of tremendous value. The International Boundary and Water Commission has agreed to leave the oil and gas rights with the people of the area. A program must be worked out to facilitate the drilling for these minerals under the lake proper.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I am not opposed to the \$2,500,000 in the bill. That money is to be used to construct power facilities which I think are needed, but I do believe the Appropriations Committee should examine most carefully the request when it comes in in a few months from now in the regular budget. They should review the 47,000 acres for park purposes. Personally I do not believe that land should be used for recreational purposes; it should be used for the production of food and fiber for the people.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I, too, want only the minimum amount of land to be taken that is necessary for the lake. We have a problem there in the fact that the lake will extend for a distance of 55 miles, so there is going to be some land necessarily taken.

May I say also that during the last Congress I received an appropriation as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands to do some of the very things which the gentleman has suggested in connection with revision of the public land laws and a return to private enterprise of as much land as it is practical to return to private enterprise, which is now owned by the Federal Government. Over 440,000,000 acres are owned by the Federal Government. There has been no general revision of these land laws since Teddy Roosevelt's day.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to know why the National Park Service has to take over any jurisdiction. I hope the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will dig deeply into this problem because the greatest stagnation we have in the Nation today is due to the situation that has existed through some two or three decades and the whole matter needs to be reviewed by a committee of the Congress.

Mr. BENTSEN. We have about 5,000 of those public land laws that are in

desperate need of revision, antiquated, and conflicting. Now, we have started this revision. My subcommittee received an appropriation of \$25,000, and we turned over one-half of that back to the Government.

Mr. HORAN. In saying that, I am not against a proper national park system, but it has gone far out of balance and it is stagnating a lot of our areas.

Mr. BENTSEN. We have commenced the work and it is my hope that the gentlemen on the other side will carry on the work for revision of the public land laws.

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the public land problem has come under our jurisdiction. It is rather disturbing when you find the Federal Government year after year adding additional land to what they already have. They own about one-fourth of all of the land in the United States. In some of the Western States it goes up to more than 80 percent. The gentleman from Texas said 420 million acres. That is just inside of the United States. Actually it is over 800 million acres owned by the Federal Government including Alaska. In checking with the Interior Department they think they added about 10 million acres in the last 10 years. As has been said, the public land laws are in quite a mess and have been for some time. It was my hope, when I made the statement before the full committee, that it would be possible to get some of the Federal land that is not now needed back upon the tax rolls, but every department of Government resists that effort. They want more land instead of less. Resolutions have been introduced to correct this situation. I believe the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] will continue the work that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] has started relative to land laws. I think we need an invoice, a checking up of the amount of public lands, who owns them, and what laws govern them. It is a long, tedious task, but I am sure the Congress in some committee ought to undertake that task.

Now, as to Falcom Dam, the gentleman from Texas and myself held a hearing there last November. Falcom Dam, I think, in the end, will be a credit to this country and to Mexico. Under State Department supervision they started to build a dam; indeed, this last month they shut the water off on the Rio Grande River so it is now held back, but they have made no preparation for the delivery of water downstream. I hope the great State of Texas will be able to iron out some of their water laws and difficulties so that they may know who is going to get the water. It has not been decided as of now. The same is true of the power plant. The Reclamation Division generally decides who is to get the water and the power before the dams are built. In other words, they have the cart ahead of the horse in this in-

stance. They will back the water up some 50 miles. They are covering up three towns in that area, two of them older than the city of Philadelphia. They are covering up 18 cemeteries that date back to the early history of the United States, and if you do not think that is a disturbing factor to this small area, you should go down and listen to some of their stories. They are covering 8,000 acres of some of the finest irrigated land you have ever seen and not making preparation to handle some of the problems connected with those people who will be displaced. Nevertheless, I think it has to go ahead because it is one of those things that we started to do. In fact, the water is shut off and backed up now, and that will prevent floods down the river.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I believe that you have had referred to your committee a bill which I introduced several days ago which provides that the lands taken over by the Government would still be subject to local taxation, or in lieu thereof, contribution should be made to the State or political subdivision to take care of the loss of taxation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope the House, when the time comes, will consider the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] for a full study of the public-land problems and the thousands of laws governing public lands. I hope that you will give us that support. It is a long and tedious job; nothing glamorous about it. It is a job I feel Congress should approach and do. The Interior Committee looks forward to starting in on that job in the 83d Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Federal-aid highways," to remain available until expended, \$185 million, which sum is composed of \$72,500,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, and \$112,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

FEDERAL AID TO IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, this aid is a direct obligation by the Government. The Government by taking over local activities must assume some local responsibilities entailed. I am deeply interested in the subject which was just discussed on the floor by our colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], with reference to the enormous holdings of the land area in the various States of the Union by the Federal Government. It has become a problem so important to the economy of many of the smaller political divisions in which these lands are situated that some remedial legislation should be passed to get these lands back into private ownership and on the tax rolls.

A recent discussion of this problem in which there is set forth the percentage of the Government-owned lands situated in the Western States appeared in the

current March issue of Farm Journal. I am including this article as a part of these remarks:

NEW LAND LAW FOR THE WEST?—STOCKMEN ARE OFFERING A BILL INTENDED TO END THEIR FIGHT WITH THE FOREST SERVICE

(By Paul Friggens)

Our worst landlord-tenant problem in the Nation today exists not in the South but in the 11 Western States.

In the west, 54 percent of the land is in the hands of a single landlord—the United States Government. Five thousand different (and sometimes conflicting) laws, rules, and regulations now hamstringing sheep and cattle-men who graze these lands.

Even those who are awarded grazing rights claim that their permits may not be worth the paper they're written on. Uncle Sam can and does kick off permittees at will.

Aroused stockmen hope to correct this situation, at last, at this Congress. After 3 years' careful study of the problem, they are introducing a bill which, if passed, would:

1. Give stockmen stability of tenure, so that they can plan and produce from one year to the next.

2. Grant the stockman his day in court, and a chance to appeal from bureaucratic rulings.

The two biggest Federal land administrators are the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Land Management in the Interior Department.

The Forest Service now manages 140 million acres in the West alone, and permits livestock grazing for pay on about 80 million acres. The Bureau of Land Management runs another 169 million acres outside the forest.

Back in 1934, stockmen sponsored the Taylor law, which now governs Interior lands. The Taylor law brought order and stability to these lands.

It gives stockmen a chance to say something about running the public range. While it's not perfect, it is regarded as one of the best land laws that the West has ever had.

But the rules and regulations of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management contradict each other.

In California I once saw a fence separating identical pasturages—one administered by Interior, the other by Agriculture.

"On one side we can turn in June 15," the rancher explained, "and on the other, July 15. See any difference?"

What the stockmen want is a uniform Federal grazing act to govern both agencies. More specifically, they want a Taylor law for the Forest Service.

Regardless of how long they have been grazing these lands, stockmen don't have any rights—just privileges.

The Forest Service has slashed sheep and cattle numbers between 50 percent and 60 percent on their lands, and there's nothing the stockmen can do about it. The Forest Service is plaintiff, prosecutor, judge, and jury. While it has talked conservation it has denied, with few exceptions, the requests of stockmen to fence, develop water, and reseed the range, even at their own expense.

The time has come, ranchers believe, to reverse these practices, consolidate range laws, set up uniform rules, improve the public lands, and stabilize the livestock industry.

Here's how the new bill would operate as law:

1. No danger of a land grab by stockmen, as the Forest Service and sportsmen's group charge.

The bill guarantees that the Government shall have unlimited discretion to say whether lands should be used for grazing, recreation, wildlife, flood control, or any other purpose.

It reads: "Nothing herein contained shall be construed to restrict the power of the

Secretary to limit or discontinue the grazing use of any lands under his jurisdiction."

2. The bill recognizes grazing as a use, and would govern it the same as mining and irrigation, by the familiar rule: "First in time is first in right." Thus, a stockman would be sure of his grazing rights as long as he holds base property and abides by grazing rules.

3. A stockman could go to court under the proposed law; at present, he can be cut at a bureau's whim and without recourse. He could demand a hearing, and appeal to Federal courts from any arbitrary ruling.

4. No more "transfer cuts"—a favorite device of the Forest Service.

A stockman now has to own a certain amount of base property to get a permit—has to be able to feed his stock when not on the forest. But if a permittee dies, the widow may suffer a "transfer cut" when she inherits her husband's holdings. Her cattle numbers on the forest may be cut 10 to 20 percent.

If she sells the home ranch the permit that goes with it may be cut another 20 to 30 percent. And if she wants to start her boy or girl in a 4-H breeding stock project she is liable to a transfer cut, since this, in effect, would be entering into a partnership.

5. Ranchers could improve Federal range at their own expense.

Heretofore the Forest Service has largely prohibited range improvement, fearing that ranchers might obtain vested rights.

The new bill encourages range improvement at private expense and in cooperation with Federal agencies. A stockman can build drift fences, trails, and roads, develop water, and reseed. If he loses a permit through no fault of his own he is repaid for improvements.

6. It calls for fair fees to be set by independent governmental agencies on all Federal grazing lands.

Critics charge that the proposed law would permanently freeze grazing permits, and give stockmen a vested right to pass on privileges to their heirs, or to lease or sell permits and thus monopolize public land. They also charge that the right of appeal to courts on grazing problems could bog down Government administration completely.

In any event you'll hear a lot about this bill. It is not sponsored by a small, selfish minority of stockmen, as has been charged. It was prepared by the American National Cattlemen's Association and the National Wool Growers; is backed by the American Farm Bureau, the National Council of Grazing Directors, and by the vast majority of range users.

"This bill would put into law what is already established range custom," says the American National Cattlemen's Association. "It will stabilize the livestock industry while protecting the public's interest in grazing lands."

| | Percent |
|-----------------|---------|
| Arizona..... | 69.4 |
| California..... | 45.7 |
| Colorado..... | 37.4 |
| Idaho..... | 64.7 |
| Montana..... | 36.5 |
| Nevada..... | 85 |
| New Mexico..... | 45.6 |
| Oregon..... | 52.7 |
| Utah..... | 71.3 |
| Washington..... | 35 |
| Wyoming..... | 51.6 |

In my own State of Oregon over 52 percent of the land area is held by the Federal Government. On January 3, I introduced H. R. 206, which is identical with bills introduced by me at previous sessions of the Congress which would require the Federal Government to assume the tax burden on these enormous holdings of the land area of the States

which have been taken over by the Federal Government and removed from the tax rolls. In many of the counties the problem is so great that the ordinary activities of the county cannot be financed without receiving the equivalent to taxes from these Government-owned lands.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of my bill, H. R. 206, will not provide a solution to this problem of excessive ownership of land by the Federal Government. These holdings of lands by the National Government should be broken up and returned to the several States of the Union in which they are situated. While it is true the Government in the operation of its business and particularly for military purposes, does require ownership of considerable acreage in various States of the Union the enormous holdings now held by the Government far exceed the need in this respect, therefore I am urging that legislation be enacted at this session of the Congress returning these lands to the States in which they are situated.

The following is the text of my bill H. R. 206:

A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes

Be it enacted etc., That all real property in the continental United States which heretofore, subsequent to December 7, 1941, was acquired, or which shall hereafter be acquired, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, by or on behalf of the United States for general military purposes (including property acquired for, or for use in connection with, fortifications, coast defenses, military camps, cantonments, proving grounds, training areas, bomb-testing areas, and the manufacture of munitions), together with the improvements on any such real property at the time such property is so acquired, shall remain subject to taxation by the State and political subdivision in which such property is located, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall not apply to any property with respect to which such power of taxation is waived in accordance with State law by the State or political subdivision in which such property is located. Any property covered by any such waiver shall not thereafter be subject to such taxation by the State or political subdivision, as the case may be, so long as such property is held by or on behalf of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak briefly on another subject which is very dear to the hearts of those of us in the Pacific Northwest and particularly the State of Oregon.

OREGON PIONEERS IN STATUARY HALL

Mr. Chairman, on last Saturday, February 14, the 94th anniversary of the admission of Oregon as a State of the Union, a significant ceremony took place in Statuary Hall in the Capitol. The bronze statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and Rev. Jason Lee were presented to the National Government by the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, in behalf of Paul L. Patterson, Governor of Oregon. The statues were accepted in behalf of the Nation by Vice President Nixon.

Significant and noteworthy addresses were delivered by Mr. Leslie M. Scott,

director of the Oregon Historical Society, on the life and work of Dr. McLoughlin, benefactor of Oregon settlers, and by Dr. G. Herbert Smith, president of the Willamette University on Rev. Jason Lee, whom he characterized as missionary and colonizer. Dr. Burt Brown Barker, chairman of the Oregon Statuary Committee and vice president of the University of Oregon, gave an address entitled "Oregon, the Unique Prize."

While it is true these are the first statues of Oregon pioneers selected by the State of Oregon for Statuary Hall in the Nation's Capitol, the statue of Edward Dickinson Baker, late Senator from Oregon and distinguished military statesman and friend of Abraham Lincoln, occupies a prominent place in Statuary Hall. However, it was not placed there through the request of the State but by the Congress itself. Each State in the Union is accorded the privilege of placing in Statuary Hall two statues of its distinguished citizens.

Mr. Chairman, in acquainting you, and my colleagues, of the great contributions made by these pioneers whose statues are now placed in Statuary Hall by the people of Oregon on the 94th anniversary as a State, I am extending in these remarks the dedicatory addresses of Dr. G. Herbert Smith and Mr. Leslie M. Scott, which give in some detail the significant accomplishments of these two great Oregon pioneers:

JASON LEE: MISSIONARY AND COLONIZER

(Address by Dr. G. Herbert Smith, president, Willamette University, on the occasion of the dedication and unveiling of statues of Jason Lee and Dr. John McLoughlin)

The story of Jason Lee and the historic part he played in the colonization and development of the Oregon country gives us an outstanding example of a man and a task well met. A lesser man in physical power, endurance, courage, spiritual devotion, personal leadership, and adaptability, would have been doomed to failure in the assignment which Lee undertook as a service to God, his church, and to mankind.

The first 30 years of Jason Lee's life were spent in a remarkably effective preparation for the 12 years of his unusual ministry—for Jason Lee was first of all a minister and a missionary. His sturdy Old England and New England ancestry may rightfully be included in his preparation for his life work, for he came from a long line of rugged pioneering forebears. Jason was the youngest of 16 children, and was born on June 28, 1803, in a log house built by his father in what is now Stanstead Parish, Quebec, Canada. Careful historians of the period emphasize the fact that the father, Daniel Lee, a veteran of the Revolutionary War, and his wife, Sarah, as well as their children, were American citizens.

While Jason was yet a young lad his father died leaving the mother with little means of support, and Jason went to live with his brother Elias, 25 years his senior. During these years there developed a life-long attachment between Jason Lee and his nephew, Daniel, 3 years his junior, who was to become his companion and missionary to Oregon.

For Jason Lee there was a brief period of formal education in the village school at Stanstead, interrupted by economic necessity. He recalled that at the age of 13 he was self-supporting—thrown upon the world without money to provide for all his wants by his own industry. His work as a farm-hand followed by toilsome years in the lum-

ber camps, contributed to the knowledge and physical power of the young giant.

The changes which came in the life of Jason Lee, turning him from logging camps to the Christian ministry and the Oregon mission field, were largely influenced by two great personalities with whom he came in contact. The first of these men he met in 1826. The Reverend Richard Pope, Wesleyan missionary, led a remarkable religious awakening on the Stanstead circuit. To him goes the honor of winning Jason Lee to the services of the church. Lee's diary reveals the influence of his religious experience and the milestone it wrought in his career. He wrote: "I was now by my own consent, the property of another, and His glory and not my own gratification must be the object of my pursuit."

In the years which immediately followed, Lee continued his manual labor with study and preaching on the side. There was a growing conviction, however, that he must more fully equip himself for the ministry. Accordingly, in 1829, at age 26, he returned to the Massachusetts village of his ancestors and entered the young Wilbraham Academy. His fellow student, Osmon C. Baker, later to become a Methodist Bishop, gave us a personal description of Lee at the time of his enrollment: "Jason Lee was a large, athletic young man, 6 feet and 3 inches in height, with a fully developed frame, and a constitution like iron.

"His piety was deep and uniform, and his life, in a very uncommon degree, pure and exemplary. In those days of extensive and powerful revivals, I used to observe with what confidence and satisfaction seekers of religion would place themselves under his instruction. They regarded him as a righteous man whose prayers availed much."

It was such a young man who attracted the attention of another great personality—Dr. Wilbur Fisk, then principal at Wilbraham Academy. Fisk, the distinguished educator, recognized Lee's superior qualities and gave him particular attention. As is often the case with great teachers, it was Fisk who influenced his pupil, Jason Lee, to undertake his distinctive life assignment—the mission to Oregon.

Lee had returned to his home community where he was preaching and teaching in the Stanstead Academy. During this period the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church was deeply moved by an article in the Christian Advocate and Journal which told of the visit of four Flathead Indians to St. Louis, the trading center of the West. The article concluded that "the red men from the Flathead Tribe of Oregon had been sent by a council of their chiefs, as delegates to St. Louis to inquire concerning the word of the Great Spirit; that in prosecution of their object, they had traveled 2,000 miles through rugged mountains, barren plains, and dangerous enemies, enduring cold and heat, thirst and hunger, and many hardships."

The immediate and spontaneous response to this article was that the Gospel must be taken to the Oregon country. The leaders of the Methodist Church at once urged a mission to the Flathead Indians and Dr. Wilbur Fisk, who had become the first president of Wesleyan University, led out in an appeal for a missionary effort. As soon as the general mission board had voted to establish a mission, Fisk recalled the devoted student of Wilbraham Academy, and urged that Jason Lee be appointed. In June, the New England Conference ordained Jason Lee as "Missionary to the Flathead Indians" and his former teacher expressed his warm approval:

"Our esteemed brother, Jason Lee, was appointed by Bishop Hedding at the late session of the New England Conference for that mission. Brother Lee is one whom all who know him judge well qualified for the enterprise. He is a man on whom my

mind rested when the subject was first agitated. I know him well, and can most cordially recommend him to all the friends of the enterprise as one worthy of their confidence."

Jason Lee left his home on August 9, 1833, but soon discovered that there were many problems and much to accomplish before the trip to Oregon could be attempted. The next several months were spent in travel in the East holding missionary meetings to raise money for the enterprise. During this period, Jason Lee also associated with himself two men who became his most able and loyal colleagues—his nephew, Daniel Lee, and Cyrus Shepard, a young Boston schoolmaster.

In our day of air travel when any point in the country can be reached in a few hours, it is difficult for us to comprehend the magnitude of the problem which faced Jason Lee in reaching the Oregon Country and the scene of his labors. Fortunately he learned of Capt. Nathaniel J. Wyeth, who recently had returned to Boston from his first journey west, and arrangements were made for the Lee party to accompany Wyeth's second expedition, which was scheduled to leave Independence, Mo., in April 1834. The trip to St. Louis was made by boat on the Ohio River with stops en route to hold missionary meetings and secure additional finance. Across Missouri Jason Lee and his nephew made a strenuous trip by horseback. At Independence, two lay assistants, Philip L. Edwards and Courtney M. Walker, were added to the mission party and the little band with packs, pack saddles, horses and cows, was ready to join Captain Wyeth's large party of travelers—westward over the dimly blazed Oregon Trail.

From that spring Monday, April 28, 1834, days turned into eventful weeks, and weeks into months, as the caravan moved steadily westward. In the course of the journey, Jason Lee repeatedly demonstrated his good judgment, his courage, and his capacity for leadership. Often when Captain Wyeth was away from the main party to hunt or trade, it was Jason Lee who acted as his lieutenant in command. A sincere tribute was paid to Mr. Lee by one of his fellow travelers, the Philadelphia physician and naturalist, John K. Townsend, who wrote:

"Mr. Lee is a great favorite with the men, deservedly so, and there are probably few persons to whose preaching they would have listened with so much complaisance. I have often been amused and pleased by Mr. Lee's manner of reproving them for the coarseness and profanity of expression which is so universal among them. The reproof, although decided, clear and strong, is always characterized by the mildness and affectionate manner peculiar to the man; and though the good effect of the advice may not be discernible, yet it is always treated with respect, and its utility acknowledged."

The land journey was completed with the arrival of the party at Fort Walla Walla on the first day of September. Two weeks later, after a barge trip on the Columbia River, the mission party reached journey's end and moored their barge on the beach in front of Fort Vancouver. There, two great personages of early Oregon first met. Jason Lee was greeted by Dr. John McLoughlin, and this meeting marked the beginning of a friendship never to be broken between the big-hearted chief factor of the Columbia River district of the Hudson's Bay Company and the missionary to the Flatheads.

In making the decision to establish the mission in the valley of the Willamette, Jason Lee was largely influenced by the advice of Dr. McLoughlin who pointed out the danger of attempting a mission farther east in the Flathead country. The mission site selected was on a broad rich river bottom, 10 miles northwest of the present city of Salem. Work was started at once on a per-

manent shelter. Jason Lee records a vivid picture of the first weeks of labor:

"We landed where we now are in October 1834, and pitched our tents, unloaded our canoes, and commenced building a house. The rainy season was approaching and I did not like the idea of living in an Indian hut. We labored under disadvantages for we were not carpenters. We, however, went into the woods and cut the timber. We took the green trees and split them, and hewed out boards for our floors. We could not advance very swiftly, and we did not finish our house till after the rainy season had commenced."

From his earliest days in Oregon, Jason Lee thought in terms of colonization and permanent settlements. In his first letter to his friend Dr. Fisk, he reported:

"I have requested the board not to send any more single men, but to send men with families. I have also advised that Daniel's chosen be sent as soon as possible. A greater favor could not be bestowed upon this country, than to send it pious, industrious, intelligent females."

The plea for additions to the mission family was Jason Lee's continuing message. Finally, the board acted to send reinforcements starting in 1837. The first party sailed from Boston Harbor to Oregon aboard the *Hamilton* in 1836. Included were Miss Susan Downing, engaged to marry Cyrus Shepard, and Miss Anna Maria Pittman. The latter became the wife of Jason Lee and was destined to be the first white woman to die in the Oregon country.

In the spring of 1835, 30 acres of prairie land were plowed and planted with seed, and in this small way the agricultural industry of the Willamette Valley had its start. The first crops were sufficient to provide food for the missionaries as well as for a number of Indian children. Jason Lee recognized the fertility of the soil and reported to his mission board:

"The land here produces good wheat, peas, barley, oats, beans, and potatoes, but Indian corn does not flourish well."

Experience with the Indian children who came to the mission clearly indicated that education must precede an understanding of religion. Thus, an early activity was the establishment of the Indian Mission School in March 1835. This was the forerunner of the Indian Manual Labor Training School whose property was later sold to the trustees of the Oregon Institute, to become Willamette University. Jason Lee realized that his greatest hope in bringing salvation to the Indians was through the medium of education. Under the direction of Cyrus Shepard, the Mission School made rapid progress and gave the mission its greatest early evidence of success.

Jason Lee's business acumen was evidenced when he set in motion a program which led to the beginning of independent economic life for the Oregon settlers as well as the start of one of Oregon's most important industries. Lee recognized that possession of cattle was fundamental to the economic life of the mission. With this in mind he organized a joint stock company to raise money and send a delegation to California to purchase cattle. Approximately \$2,700 was secured and 800 head of Spanish cattle were purchased. Six hundred and thirty of the original purchase survived the grueling trip overland and became the foundation of Oregon's livestock and dairy industry.

While Jason Lee's missionary purpose and spirit never faltered, there is ample evidence that he had a growing realization of the utility of the work with the Indians and the importance of the growing white settlement in the Oregon country. As early as 1837 he expressed a vital interest in securing ties for the Oregon country with the Government of the United States.

The strong desire to bring the problems of the Oregon settlers to the attention of Congress, coupled with other considerations growing out of the mission, convinced Lee that a trip back to the States was imperative. He set about making plans for the journey. Prior to his departure, a meeting was called at the log mission house on March 16, 1838, and there, inspired by Jason Lee, was drafted a memorial addressed to the Congress of the United States, petitioning the extension of American jurisdiction over Oregon.

This first memorial from Oregon to the Congress was signed by every member of the mission, 17 other American citizens, and 9 French-Canadians who desired American citizenship. The historic document made a thorough and statesmanlike appraisal of the economic resources and commercial advantages of Oregon for the United States, and requested the Government of the United States to take formal and speedy possession.

Jason Lee carried this famous document from Oregon to Missouri in a container securely strapped to the side of his horse. From Missouri it followed the transportation routes of the day, over rivers, great lakes, canals, and post roads. Late in December 1838 when Lee went to the Federal Capitol for missionary meetings, this memorial was duly presented to Senator Lewis F. Linn, who, in turn, introduced it to the Senate on January 28, 1839, where it was ordered printed and distributed.

About this time, Jason Lee replied to an inquiry on Oregon from Representative Caleb Cushing, member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Lee's reply of January 17, 1839, left no doubt as to the importance which Jason Lee placed on the permanent peopling of Oregon with white settlers, and the urgency of extending United States control over the area. The statesmanship and vision of the Oregon colonizer is revealed by his statement:

"And to whom shall we look, to whom can we look, for the establishment of wholesome laws to regulate our infant but rising settlements, but to the Congress of our own beloved country? The country (Oregon) will be settled, and that speedily, from some quarter; and it depends very much upon the speedy action of Congress what that population shall be. * * * It may be thought that Oregon is of little importance; but, rely upon it, there is the germ of a great State."

Jason Lee's tour of the East was successful both in securing needed financial backing and in inducing a large company of missionary settlers to return with him to Oregon. This second trip to the Valley of the Willamette was to be made aboard a new three-masted sailing ship, the *Lausanne*. Included in the 51 members of the party was Jason Lee's second wife, the former Lucy Thompson, whom he had married in July.

Despite the caution given by Lee to the mission board in the selection of personnel for the Oregon family, it became evident to Lee in the course of the voyage, that some of the new additions might prove to be a handicap in his work. He shrewdly observed: "I have been watching our reinforcements in order to discover their traits of character, and I trust we shall be able to turn them all to some good account in that dark land; but I am persuaded that it is one thing to be a missionary on the *Lausanne* and another to be a good one in Oregon."

On June 1, 1840, the *Lausanne* dropped anchor near Fort Vancouver, and the work of the reinforced Oregon Mission was started at once. Again Jason Lee demonstrated his vision and sagacity by the careful location of his new mission stations, every one of which was in an area vital to the United States in the later contests for the Oregon country.

General progress was being made in the colonization and missions enterprises.

Permanent houses and churches were built and the causes of religion, education, and formal government were advanced. In 1841 Jason Lee was elected chairman and presided over an informal conference at Champoege to consider local civil government for Oregon. He was also a prime factor in the important Champoege meeting of May 1843.

On January 17, 1842, Jason Lee called a meeting at his residence to formulate plans and establish the Oregon Institute. Mr. Lee was elected first chairman of the board of trustees of this pioneer educational institution of the West, which soon changed its name to Willamette University.

In spite of the progress and accomplishments of the mission, under Lee's leadership, the signs he had noted on the *Lausanne* developed into outright discontent, which was highly injurious to the mission cause. Some of the later arrivals who were obviously unsuited to the rugged Oregon life, soon returned east to give biased and unfavorable reports. Others in Oregon, who became discouraged, forwarded letters, some of which criticized the mission superintendent. Lee realized that his work must have unquestioned support, both in Oregon and by the home board, and he determined to make the long trip east again to appear personally before the board where he was certain he could adjust all difficulties. Furthermore, he felt the urgency of the trip to place the claims of American citizens personally before proper congressional officials since the joint occupancy with Great Britain was soon to be terminated.

It was not until Lee was actually in Honolulu on his return trip that he learned that without a hearing by his board, he had been superseded as a leader of the Oregon mission by the Reverend George Gray, who, at that very time, was journeying around the Horn on his way to Oregon.

In the appearance before the mission board, Lee was able to answer all complaints and accusations which had been made by his dissatisfied associates. He was publicly vindicated and retained his title, "missionary to Oregon," even though the precipitant action in sending Reverend Gray made it impossible for Jason Lee to continue as superintendent.

Jason Lee stayed on in the East, working in the interests of the mission and the Oregon institute as long as his health would permit. To the last he held to the hope that he might again return to his adopted land. The hardships and exposure which he had endured worked against him, however, and on March 12, 1845, he concluded his ministry and a great pioneering career.

At age 41, in just 12 years as missionary to Oregon, this man had organized and largely financed his Flathead Mission. He was the first missionary to enter the Oregon country. He established the first American settlement in Oregon and led in the formation of local government. He introduced the basis of sound economic life and established the first university west of Missouri. His was the statesman's vision of Oregon's value to the Union and its future role as an American State. He carried the first memorial to Congress petitioning the extension of American jurisdiction over the Oregon country. Jason Lee's place in the history of Oregon and the Nation is secure. The people of Oregon who are the spiritual heirs of this distinguished missionary and colonizer must say with the poet Alfred Noyes, "If I saw farther, 'twas because I stood on giant shoulders."

DR. JOHN McLOUGHLIN: BENEFACTOR OF OREGON SETTLERS

(Address at dedication of McLoughlin Statue, Statuary Hall, Washington, D. C., February 14, 1953, Statehood Day, by Leslie M. Scott)

Dr. John McLoughlin was a foremost man, in Oregon, for 30 years, a century ago.

Heights of achievement and depths of frustration marked his life; but throughout, he maintained equipoise of spirit, dignity, and benevolence.

After a century's delay, we raise a statue to the memory of this man of peace and goodness.

His words could well adorn his monument, as they do his memory:

"I fed the hungry, caused the sick to be attended and nursed, furnished them with every assistance so long as they required it. * * * And in some cases had to put up with a great deal. I founded this settlement [Oregon City] and prevented a war between the United States and Great Britain." (Oregon Pioneer Association Transactions, 1880, 54-55; Marshall, Acquisition of Oregon, I, 430-40.)

History's verdict concurs with McLoughlin's, that he saved from war, by helping Americans of the four migrations, 1842-1845, exhausted, sick and destitute, on the last miles of their Oregon Trail journey.

In those years came to Oregon 5,500 Americans—men, women, and children. They raised the majority of the Americans, over the British, to 10 to 1, and moved the British, in 1846, to hasty acceptance of the present boundary between the State of Washington and the Province of British Columbia; previously refused by them for 30 years.

The election of President Polk in 1844 hinged on the boundary issue of "fifty-four forty or fight." Such a boundary, that far north, at the southern end of Alaska, would have doubled the area of the American Oregon country.

The British saw a better bargain in the boundary that they conceded, without war, at 49°. Their diplomats, at last, wisely followed the prudence of Dr. McLoughlin. The good doctor, versed in the history and spirit of the American people, had more wisdom and diplomacy, here, far away, than all the King's Ministers in London, and their agents in Oregon.

Americans then turned from a war on Britain to a war on Mexico, and conquest of California.

As master of the British fur trade and subject to the British Crown, McLoughlin faced the continental spread of the American Nation. He knew the futility of British resistance, in Oregon as elsewhere, to the sweep of Americans from the Atlantic.

McLoughlin was chief factor, manager, of the fur-trade Hudson's Bay Company, in the Pacific Northwest in 1824-45. The British censured him for aiding the American settlers, prior to the boundary treaty of 1846: even called him traitor; so that, in his own words: "From self-respect I resigned my position, by which I sacrificed \$12,000 per annum." (Oregon Pioneer Association Transactions, 1880, p. 55.)

Aggravating the censure were acts of his company, taking away his sole command, and giving authority to a board of managers, 2 of whose 3 members were other chief factors; and in cutting off his salary, or extra pay, of \$2,400 a year (£500). His resignation became final in 1846. American radicals charged him with inciting Indians to massacre Americans: "I," answered McLoughlin, "who saved all I could." (Oregon Historical Quarterly, XLV, 1-5.)

McLoughlin became eligible to American citizenship at Oregon City in 1849, respected and beloved; and was elected mayor in 1851; yet was deprived of his land claim there, while he lived, by grasping missionary rivals who made a legal case against him, from his former British allegiance and belated American citizenship. Other British were not so deprived. Five years after his death, the State of Oregon, in 1862, restored the land to his family survivors.

However, it appears from the probate of his estate at Oregon City that the injury affected more his pride and sense of injustice than his substance. His estate amounted

to \$150,000, including his pending land claim.

His annual compensation as a partner ranged from \$1,500 to \$5,500 during most of his 22 years' tenure. His share was two eighty-fifths of 40 percent of profits: nearly 1 percent. In addition he received a special salary, as physician, ranging from \$700 to \$2,400 a year. His partnership shares continued 10 years after his withdrawal: 5 years in full portion, and 5 years in one-half portion. He was the richest man of his day in Oregon Territory. (*Oregon Historical Quarterly*, XLV, 2-4.)

But riches could not make happiness, against the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. Family bereavements added afflictions. Age brought infirmities, took from him the cheer and resolution which had fortified his earlier years.

What was the background, the experience that guided the judgments of this able man? Where and how did he learn to respect the growing American Nation; the futility of holding a fur-trade wilderness and Indian preserve, against settlers; the terrors and sufferings of victims of warpath savages; the revenges of American palefaces?

McLoughlin was a man of learning and culture and wisdom. He was familiar with the history of the fur trade, from Hudson Bay, St. Lawrence River, the Great Lakes, to the Rockies, the Pacific, and the Arctic, 200 years.

The fur trade grew from the search for gold, and for the Western Sea, the Pacific. Early navigators, after Hudson on the Atlantic and Bering and Cook on the Pacific, revealed the wealth of furs.

Atlantic explorers sought a ship passage. Pacific explorers sought a river course to the ocean from the heart of the continent. Settlers followed fur traders.

The fur trade began at Hudson Bay a century before it opened on the Oregon coast. It became the chief objective of British policy. That policy opposed settlers; patronized Indians as fur hunters. Britain expelled France from America in a war for mastery of the fur trade. Even yet, the fur trade is a lucrative business in Canada. The Hudson's Bay Co. is the longest lived successful trade enterprise in the world; nearly 300 years old.

The fur trade was an old vocation to McLoughlin. He understood the ruthless conflict of interests between fur traders, and with settlers. He knew that the American Colonies rebelled against Britain because Parliament and the ministers had forbidden the Colonies to settle in the fur-trade preserve, east of the Alleghanies, by the Quebec Act of 1774. The British at home intended to pursue the same fur-trade exclusions in the Columbia River country. (*Oregon Historical Quarterly*, VIII, 308.) But McLoughlin set aside that policy, as to American settlers.

The Quebec Act united to McLoughlin's native Quebec the Northwest Territory. That Territory included later Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and part of Minnesota. The Quebec Act aimed to keep out American settlers. But George Rogers Clark, brilliant Revolutionary soldier, led the successful conquest for American settlers against the British and their tomahawk allies. We may recall that William Clark, the Oregon explorer, of Lewis and Clark fame, here in 1805-06, was younger brother of George Rogers Clark. McLoughlin remembered that Lewis and Clark explored, in 1804-06, to offset the British claims on the upper Missouri, and in the Rockies and Oregon.

Prior to 1841, for nearly two decades, his authority may be said to have been absolute in this region. He ruled virtually as a feudal lord, yet kindly, wisely, justly, firmly. He kept Indians off the warpath, befriended travelers, missionaries, settlers. The Cayuse War of 1847-48 broke out after his retirement.

McLoughlin saw the settlers taking possession of Oregon, like their forebears had done in the country north and south of the Ohio; and setting up the Oregon Provisional Government in 1843-45, to take, from the British Hudson's Bay Company and Dr. McLoughlin, the control which they had wielded for 30 years, since Astor's withdrawal in 1813. In those three decades, the British had defeated 11 groups of Americans in Oregon (Carey, Oregon, 262), with trade competition. The British held the allegiance of the Indians by staying off their lands.

Doubtless, McLoughlin had read in his Vancouver library the American Declaration of Independence which denounced the "intolerable acts" of Parliament and Crown; the extension of their "arbitrary" and "absolute" rule of Quebec to the Thirteen Colonies; the incitement of "the merciless Indian savages" against "the inhabitants of our frontiers." (Quotes from Declaration of Independence.)

McLoughlin sensed that the American settlers were successors to the French and Spanish rivals of the British, for the empire of America. Three centuries of American expansion looked down upon the scene in Oregon; and earlier centuries of liberalizing crusades and Renaissance and Reformation that opened the way to religious and political freedom.

McLoughlin had risen to chief trader of the North West Company, on Lake Superior. He knew the bitter strife between the British and the French and the Americans for the fur trade. He had seen, as a youth, the devastating British conflicts between Hudson's Bay Company and North West Company. He remembered the civil war between fur traders and settlers in the Winnipeg country in 1816. He saw the impossibility of colonizing Oregon with British subjects, to outnumber Americans; and of fortifying Oregon with British military forces. He knew the horrors of frontier wars, and of alliances with Indians; as by the French against the British, in Canada; and by the British against the Americans, in Northwest Territory. He saw the expansion of the American Nation, from Atlantic to Mississippi, and to Rocky Mountains and Oregon.

He told his London company in 1843 that the Americans had the power to take Fort Vancouver. He appealed for protection, but was informed that no protection could be given. (*Oregon Historical Quarterly*, XXXIII, 222.) He then joined the settlers' provisional government, in 1845, and wrote to his London superiors:

"We have yielded to the wishes and request of the respectable part of the people of this country, of British and American origin, by uniting with them in the formation of a provisional and temporary government, having for its object the protection of life and property." (August 30, 1845; *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, XXIX, 72; XVI, 313; XXXIII, 223-24.)

Soon thereafter came four British warships, one to Columbia River and three to Puget Sound (frigates *Modeste*, and *America*, *Fisgard* and *Cormorant*). But their visit was useless. Their protection was "too little and too late." The British in that year moved their headquarters of the North Pacific from Vancouver to Victoria, as a precaution against the Americans.

Before the Americans set up the provisional government at Champoege in 1843, McLoughlin admitted that they "must adopt some plan to keep peace in the country." (*Oregon Historical Quarterly*, XIII, 147; Carey, Oregon, 398.) Americans, he said, were the majority in the Columbia country after 1828; and in the Willamette after 1840. (*Oregon Historical Quarterly*, XXXIII, 221.)

Yes, McLoughlin was versed in history and current affairs of the great republic, whose people he had to deal with in Oregon.

He said of himself in 1852, after becoming an American citizen:

"I was born in Canada (Riviere-du-loup, 1784, near northern Maine), and reared to manhood in the immediate vicinity of the United States, and * * * have found * * * many a leisure hour in studying the character of its people and the working of its institutions. I early foresaw * * * that the whole valuable country between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific * * * must become the abode of another race, American. * * * In this spirit I prepared myself to encourage, hasten, and further what I thought would be * * * inevitable. The policy * * * to check migration * * * has subjected me in Europe to strictures as untrue as they have been unjust. From 1824 to the present hour, I have spared neither time nor means, but liberally used both, to facilitate the settling of Oregon by whites * * * to relieve distress and promote the comfort and happiness of immigrants." (*Oregon Historical Quarterly*, VIII, 296.)

Two hundred years of frontier life, from Hudson Bay and Massachusetts to Columbia River, were in McLoughlin's vision at Fort Vancouver. He recognized the spirit and the vigor of Americans who had come to Oregon.

So, when Captain Parke, of the Royal Marines, one of several British agents in Oregon in 1845, who came to vaunt jingo ways of defending British interests, spoke of bringing troops from Canada, and said of the Americans: "We will hit them a good deal harder than we would other people", McLoughlin exclaimed in protest: "O Captain Parke! Captain Parke!" (Bancroft, Oregon, I, 498.)

The British agents complained that McLoughlin not only relieved the needs and distresses of Americans, but also supplied them with means of growing food crops. McLoughlin explained that he thus safeguarded against a famine in 1845. Said he, later, in 1852:

"And as people will not allow their families to starve when provisions are in their reach, and if we had not assisted them, Vancouver would have been destroyed; the world would have said we were treated in the manner our inhuman conduct deserved; the character of the Hudson's Bay Company and of its officers * * * would be covered with obloquy, and the company's business would be ruined * * * and might have involved * * * war." (*Oregon Historical Quarterly*, XXXIII, 227.)

McLoughlin protected Americans from Indians. Such occasions were frequent. When Americans were arriving at Vancouver in 1843, 800 of them, the largest migration up to that time, an Indian cried out: "It is good for us to kill these Bostons." McLoughlin rushed upon the Indian with his cane: "Who is the dog that says it is a good thing to kill these Bostons?" The fellow, trembling, said: "The Dalles Indians say so." "Well," said McLoughlin, "The Dalles Indians are dogs for saying so, and you, too." And stamped away, in warning indignation. (*Oregon Pioneer Association, Transactions*, 1880, p. 52.)

Besides his experience as a fur trader and his knowledge of history, McLoughlin had physical and mental inheritance from strong forebears, Scotch, Irish, and French, to give him poise and equilibrium. His able biographer, Dr. Burt Brown Barker, in the pamphlet especially published for this occasion (*Oregon, Prize of Discovery, Exploration, Settlement*) points out the traits that thus lineally came to our distinguished subject.

His father, John, was a Scotch-Irish Canadian; his grandfather, John, a native of Scotland. His mother was a Fraser; her mother, a French-Canadian. Our John's mother had two brothers: One of them a physician in the Napoleonic wars; the other a fur-trade partner in the North West Co. His first uncle, Simon Fraser, evidently guided our John to become a physician. The second uncle, Alexander, evidently inducted our John into the fur trade.

Biographer Barker suggests that our John "must have heard much of the fur trade in his boyhood associations in the home of his grandfather (Malcolm) Fraser" (p. 30).

Our John entered the service of the North West Co. in 1803, at the age of 19. He became a partner in 1814, at the age of 30; later chief trader at the main depot and factory on Lake Superior, Fort William. He participated in London in 1821 in the union of his company with the Hudson's Bay Company. Such union was designed to cure the warring rivalry of the two companies.

McLoughlin, at the age of 40, went to Astoria on the Columbia River, in 1824, as chief factor, or manager, of the Pacific Northwest region of the fur trade, for the Hudson's Bay Company. He accompanied the deputy governor of the company, Sir George Simpson, from Canada. Sir George chose the site for new headquarters at Vancouver. Next year McLoughlin moved the old headquarters from Astoria, where Astor's Pacific Fur Co. had established the post in 1811, and the North West Co. had bought it in 1813. From 1824 to 1846, McLoughlin directed the fur trade, at Fort Vancouver and at 30 to 40 sub-posts in this great area of 400,000 square miles.

By courtesy, McLoughlin was called governor of local affairs of his company. The real governor of his company was in London, Sir John H. Pelly; and the acting governor, or deputy, in Canada, Sir George Simpson.

McLoughlin was devoted to the Roman Catholic faith of his forbears in Canada, yet respectful of other beliefs, and never imposed his upon others, or upon their children who were under his protection.

McLoughlin was tall, erect, strong, imposing, to match his powers of mind, his wisdom, and benignity. Though quick-tempered, he could bend to concede an error, as with the Reverend Herbert Beaver, Anglican chaplain, who had offended him by sending from Vancouver to London, in 1837, a critical report. The doctor asked an explanation. "Sir," retorted the clergyman, "if you wish to know why a cow's tail grows downward, I cannot tell you; I can only cite the fact."

Up went the doctor's cane, and down with a resounding thwack upon the hapless shoulders of the saucy divine. Beaver called to his wife for his flintlock pistols, but on second thought decided not to shoot the doctor.

Next day, at a solemn auction of personal effects of a man who had drowned in the Columbia, the doctor approached the reverend and said: "Mr. Beaver, I make this public apology for the indignity I laid upon you yesterday." "Sir," exclaimed the chaplain, "I will not accept your apology."

Soon the testy chaplain returned to England. And the hasty, wise doctor continued to govern the fur trade and befriend the settlers.

Earlier Americans, those who came with Joe Meek, found McLoughlin harder to deal with than the later ones. When refused supplies by McLoughlin, they asked: "What, then, shall we do?" "Go to work! go to work! go to work!" was his answer. (Burnett, *Recollections*, 155.)

Many pioneers and writers have eulogized Dr. McLoughlin. A distinguished historian, Mrs. Frances Fuller Victor, compiler of Bancroft's Oregon, thus pays tribute:

"The constant defamations with which he was pursued under the name of patriotism, for years after the arrival of the great Methodist reinforcement (1840), must have warped any character less strong and generous than McLoughlin's; but with him it was not suffered to change his settled policy of benevolence toward all men, though it sometimes betrayed him with exhibition of resentment or of helpless protest against the devices of his enemies." (Bancroft, I, 210.)

McLoughlin's life was a contrast of victory and defeat, benevolence and sorrow, sunshine and shadow.

He was a loyal subject to Britain, pledged to hold the northern half of original Oregon to his King's domain. But his fortunes were cast with strong Americans, of superior numbers.

He ruled in Oregon, not by British might nor power, but by his humane spirit of truth, justice, benevolence.

He became a citizen of the United States, admired, respected, but despoiled of lands that were justly his, by American neighbors, whom he had aided and befriended.

"I was silent", he wrote in 1845, "in full realization that some day justice would be done me." (Oregon Historical Quarterly, XXXIII, 228.)

Now, 96 years after his sorrows closed, we Oregonians dedicate a statue to him, of grateful memory.

As in the Angel's wakening light, may we see inscribed in the book of gold, like Ben Adhem leading all the rest, for love of his fellow men, the name of Dr. John McLoughlin.

(Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 7, after line 7, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Payment to school districts: For an additional amount for payment to school districts, \$24,000,000."

(Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, many Members of the House who have known me so long may think I am appearing in a strange role now, in that my past appearances called for cuts of appropriations amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars. However, whenever a person is in the right and is on the side of justice no apology need be made, and I make none for my appearance and the presentation of this amendment restoring \$24 million for schools in defense impacted areas. Despite the fact that Commissioner McGrath did send a letter out to the school districts and tell them that the \$40 million was all that there was to be available this year, the word got out some way to all of them that there would be \$64 million available. All these school heads who are dependent upon this aid in the impacted areas have been working on that very philosophy. However, Congress today should warn all these school districts that when the appropriation is made under this act for 1954 that that appropriation is all that is going to be available for that fiscal year. In the meantime, Public Law 874 should be thoroughly studied and widely revised. As it is now, it is not realistic and the regulations issued thereunder are equally unrealistic. Under the present procedure, a child in one of these schools becomes a statistic. He is asked, "Where does your father work or where where does your mother work?" If

either works in a defense plant, the pupil then becomes one unit to be considered for allocation of part of this appropriation.

That is true even though the parents have lived in that community since they were born, and will continue to live there long after these children are grown and the impact of the Korean defense effort has passed. That has been true in all too many of these cases, hence that pupil is not actually there because of Korean defense influx. Not only that, but in many cases where defense workers have come into a community their child is not counted to help the school to get that aid because the defense worker parent happens to work in an adjoining State. For example, Johnson County, Kans., in my district, is an ideal home community. Parents move into that ideal home locality rather than live in Kansas City, Jackson County, Mo. They work in Missouri in the Ford bomber plant or at Lake City ordnance or central air defense, and similar places. Although Johnson County, Kans., has to carry the burden of educating those added children, they cannot be counted because their parents work in a different State. That is not fair and it is not just. That should be remedied. In my district, the Second of Kansas, we have some large defense plants. We have the Sunflower ordnance plant, the naval air training station, the GM jet fighter plant, and in adjoining areas in Missouri there are the Lake City ordnance plant, the Ford bomber plant, the Westinghouse jet plant, together with many many other defense plants of various types in both States. This demonstrates the need of a new study by the legislative committee, and by the Office of Education. As you can see, Mr. Chairman, for instance, in Johnson County, Kans., these various residential communities are called upon to take on this additional load of students without their proper share of these funds. Right now we are caught in a pinch and there is nothing we can logically or justly do other than recognize the need and the demand for an additional \$24 million required to carry out the provision of this public law. The general program under Public Law 874 needs a complete revision because it seems to me absolutely unrealistic that there should be today far more school districts asking for this aid under the impact of defense demands for the war in Korea than there were in World War II which was ever so much greater in its impact upon the various communities in the United States. So I hope, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the subcommittee, and the full Committee on Appropriations, which reported out this bill without the \$24 million that the House of Representatives will meet the demands upon it in the name of justice and fairness and stark reality and will restore the \$24 million for the benefit of the education of the children of America, whose homes are in defense impacted areas.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I would like to know whether the gentleman considers that the United States Government is under a moral obligation to these school districts?

PUBLIC LAW 874

Mr. SCRIVNER. Under the law, as the Congress passed it and as it was signed by the President, during the 82d Congress, there is a legislatively enacted legal obligation.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Then I am in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we could not come to some agreement as to limitation of time on this amendment. For that purpose I would like to ask how many Members would like to speak.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that we might run on for 10 or 15 minutes and see what develops, and then we could have a better idea.

Mr. TABER. I think we could have a pretty good idea now. I would suggest 1 hour. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments there-to be limited to 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FOGARTY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, in view of the interest in this amendment, I wish the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would allow us to run on for 15 or 20 minutes and then see how many might want to speak at that time. I think we could agree on a time limit then.

Mr. TABER. I think we ought to agree on the time at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 15 minutes. That ought to be sufficient.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that the gentleman make that 1 hour and a half, and then I am sure there will be no objection.

Mr. TABER. Very well. I will modify the motion to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion as modified, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. According to the list of those requesting time to speak, the Chair will recognize each Member for 1½ minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY as an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Strike out "\$24,000,000" and insert "\$20,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island, the ranking member of our subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island and to extend my remarks following his.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request and to extend my remarks following those of the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request and to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's name is not on the list.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks with the others on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire may extend their remarks on this amendment succeeding debate on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island and extend my remarks on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the request stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asked that he might yield his time to the gentleman from Rhode Island and to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and to extend my remarks.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to make this statement: Very often in the work of the House and in the committee it becomes highly desirable to limit time for debate, and that is the situation in which we presently find ourselves. I recognize also that on occasion as time is being used by Members who have asked for it a circumstance may arise where it would seem desirable and possibly would be considered as contributing to a better explanation of the problem before us if some Member yielded his time to another Member.

I think I ought to put the membership on notice that this practice of a great many Members standing up and getting their names on the list for the sole purpose of immediately yielding their time to another Member must be stopped, for it works an inequity in the division of time. I do not believe it is fair; I do not believe it is equitable; and I do not believe it is in keeping with the spirit of the arrangement by which time is limited.

I have not objected to any of these requests to yield time, but I am serving notice that hereafter any such wholesale operation will not be carried out if I can prevent it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it not against the rules of the House in a situation of this kind for one Member to yield to another?

The CHAIRMAN. It is being done by unanimous consent, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then I shall object to any further such requests.

The CHAIRMAN. Nine Members have yielded their time to the gentleman from Rhode Island. The gentleman from Rhode Island is now recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to assure the majority leader that I made no request of any individual member of this committee to yield his time to me. I may also say to the distinguished majority leader that I always thought it to be the practice in the matter of limiting debate that such request or motion was not put until debate had been had on the amendment, almost always by the member offering the amendment. I thought we were going to do that today, and I was quite disappointed when the

chairman of the Appropriations Committee moved that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1½ hours.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly, I meant no reflection upon the gentleman in respect to other Members yielding time to him and would not intimate for a moment he had made any such request. Secondly, under the rules of the House if the motion was prematurely made it was subject to a point of order which the gentleman might have made, then the motion would have undoubtedly been held to be out of order and 5 minutes would have been available to the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. I may say to the gentleman that I do not know whether it was against the rules or not, but I had the opportunity of serving as chairman of one of the appropriations subcommittees for the past 4 years and I always entertained requests of the minority to speak in opposition before we agreed or attempted to agree to close debate on a particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States in his state of the Union message to the Congress had this to say on the school construction law and this deficiency which we are talking about at the present time:

This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

That is what we have before the Committee at the present time, the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year to pay these school districts 100 percent of what the Congress promised them they would get to operate and maintain schools in these federally impacted areas. It might seem rather strange that I as a Democrat should be getting up here on the floor of the House pleading for something that a Republican President wants at the present time, but this is a matter that I have been interested in since its inception.

In 1949 and 1950 the Committee on Education and Labor selected a subcommittee to study the requirements of these various federally impacted areas. The committee spent 3 or 4 long hard months going all over the country to determine the requirements that were necessary under the Federal obligation. That subcommittee came back and reported to the Committee on Education and Labor and after 8 or 9 months of hearings in 1950 they produced a bill, which the Congress passed, the school construction law known as 815 and also a law known as 874 for the maintenance and operation of these school districts where a Federal impact existed on these particular districts.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask the gentleman from Rhode Island why he did not read all of the pertinent remarks re-

garding this subject in the President's state of the Union address.

The President also stated in connection with this program the following:

I am sure you share my conviction that the firm conditions of Federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am going to talk about the law that is on the books at the present time and if my distinguished chairman will confine his remarks to whether the law is there or not I think we can arrange a satisfactory solution of this problem.

The matter was looked into for about a year by a legislative committee of this House which produced two good bills, one for school construction and the other to help the federally impacted areas in the maintenance and operation of these schools. I remember in September 1950, over in the House Ways and Means Committee room that this bill was passed. It also carried an appropriation at that time of \$25 million, I think. As a consequence of the law enacted in September of 1950 we have been appropriating Federal funds to help share the cost of these school districts, not paying the entire amount of money but sharing the local cost in all of these local districts.

In every year they have had to come in with a deficiency. Why? Because the committee when they enacted this legislation set March 31 as the deadline for applications to be received in the Department of Education here in Washington from the local school districts.

Our distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations said yesterday that they had only obligated \$5 million. Up until this date, up until yesterday, they have received over 1,200 applications. They have already obligated over \$9 million, which is on a 60 percent entitlement. If it was on a 100 percent entitlement as they were doing a year ago they would have obligated firmly over \$12 million as of this date.

Now he also raised the question: Why have not as many applications come in? The applications are coming in this year faster than they were a year ago. The Department of Education now has more applications on file for this help in these districts than they had a year ago at this time. But, when they get most of the applications is in February and March, and these are the 2 months that the school districts are going to file their applications with the Department of Education here in Washington. Now, why are they behind, as some might say? They are not behind because they have to wait until the school year starts in September back in the local districts. It just takes 2 or 3 months—I am talking about the school officials—in the local district to determine how many children are entitled to attend or how the district is going to be reimbursed for the number of school children living in these categories spelled out under the bill. So, it takes 4 or 5 months to get their figures together in order to get their initial request here in Washington. Why has so little been obligated? Because they only make two payments. The first payment they make is on the estimate of the number of children in these particular dis-

tricts. The final payment is not made until after the end of the school year, after next June, because final payment is made on the average daily attendance of these children in school. So, as a consequence, it is practically in September next year that the final payments are made to these school districts, because they are computed on the daily average attendance of these pupils.

Some might ask why did I reduce this figure from \$24 million to \$20,500,000. They are going to have a little more than \$3 million left from last year after they have made up 100 percent of the entitlements paid to all of these school districts. So, computing that a little over \$3 million, we figure they can meet 100 percent of these entitlements with \$20,500,000. The Department of Education told me only about an hour ago that if we appropriate today \$20,500,000 instead of the \$24 million on the basis of the applications they now have on hand and the estimates that they have received from their field representatives and the officials of the local school districts, we will be keeping our promise to all of these school districts not only in a legal way, but in a moral way to every school district in the United States that is affected by this particular program. Last year they received 1,819 applications and paid out on 1,750. This year at this time the applications are running ahead of last year at this time. Now, we know what happened a year ago. They came in with a deficiency last June for \$11,500,000. The committee disallowed it at that time because of extenuating circumstances, but when an amendment was offered on the floor last June not only \$11,500,000 for the maintenance and operation of these schools was allowed, but \$80 million deficiency for the school construction program. Do you remember what the vote was on a standing vote here last June? It was 147 for the amendment to 40. It carried three and a half to one, because the membership of this House knows that they have not only a legal responsibility but a moral responsibility to appropriate these funds to help these school districts carry on at the present time.

Now what is going to happen if we do not appropriate this money? It will mean that you are saying to the school districts, "We are cutting you off about 40 to 50 percent of what you expected to get."

What happens there? These school districts went out in September and hired their teachers. They are already working on an annual basis. If they do not get this money, many school districts will have to shorten their school terms, they will have to lay off teachers. Who is going to be hurt in the end? The kids in those districts who are going to have their school term shortened and these teachers who are going to lose their jobs. They are the people you should be thinking about today. They are the ones you should have uppermost in your mind today, those kids that might be deprived of some education in this fiscal year unless we live up to our legal and moral responsibilities as Members of Congress.

There may be something wrong with the law. If there is, the law should be changed. But we as members of the Committee on Appropriations I do not believe have the authority to say in the form of a limitation that this Subcommittee on Education and the full committee itself were wrong when they enacted this legislation back in 1950.

I know some amendments have been offered. They were offered last year and they will be offered this year. They will probably save much money. I am sure that the Committee on Education and Labor will review the law and come up with some savings a year from now or maybe before we finally appropriate the funds for next year. The hearings are going to start next week.

Mr. Chairman, I opposed this appropriation in 1952, last year, because of some extenuating circumstances, but I am convinced now, after going thoroughly into the law and after talking to people in my own districts in Rhode Island that have been affected by this program—and I might say in that respect that every district in Rhode Island, not only in my district but in the district of my colleague [Mr. FORAND], every district that gets anything out of this appropriation, and it is not much in the State of Rhode Island, contains Republican towns and cities, even though Rhode Island is one of the strongest Democratic States in the Union. The only towns and cities getting any help in their school districts from this appropriation are the Republican towns in my State.

So I say to you this afternoon that this is not a partisan measure. There is no partisan politics in this at all. Members on both sides of the aisle here today are interested in this program. It was not conceived in politics in 1950. I think it was a unanimous report from the Committee on Education and Labor after a year's study and hearings on the things that they found throughout the country that needed taking care of. This is not a fly-by-night proposition. We have been operating under this law now since 1950. On two other occasions the committee refused these funds. I remember in 1950 when we had a supplemental appropriation of \$25,000,000 it was opposed on the floor in the Ways and Means Committee room where we were meeting at that time. The Members were for it almost 4 to 1. We never even asked for a standing vote on it. Again last June in the closing days of our session some of the strongest advocates of economy in this Congress were for this appropriation because they know it is not only a moral but a legal responsibility of the Congress to do something in these school districts where they have no control over and where they cannot raise their taxes any more than they have, and where their bonded indebtedness, limited by State law, is practically at the top.

Mr. Chairman, I include in my remarks the following telegram:

PROVIDENCE, R. I.,
February 17, 1953.

Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives.

Imperative that benefits from Public Law 874 be continued. Number of Rhode Island

cities and towns will face critical financial problems if money is not forthcoming. Warwick reports increase of more than 800 pupils over last year. School committee has included in its receipt \$29,000 from Public Law 874. If Federal money had not been available last year the town would have faced serious situation. Impact of Quonset workers has resulted in increased school population. East Greenwich reports that if town loses Federal aid such loss would impair educational program to a marked degree. The increased enrollment in town is caused by activity at Quonset Naval Air Station.

Newport reports that 1,940 pupils or 43 percent of school enrollments have parents who are affiliated with naval reservations in either civilian or military capacity. Four hundred live on Federal property. Naval activity has caused increase of 900 pupils in the schools during the last year, making it necessary for the establishment of double sessions and a building program which includes an elementary and high school. In 1950-51, \$94,000 was received from Public Law 874. In 1951-52 \$177,000 was received. In 1952-53 an estimated amount of \$218,000 has been anticipated. This last amount represents 20 percent of the 1952-53 school budget. It also represents \$3.50 per thousand on the tax rate which is already at its maximum by State law. If assistance from Public Law 874 is withdrawn it is faced with additional educational costs which it cannot bear.

Jamestown reports increase of \$18,000 over last year for education due to the impact of military personnel. It represents \$3 a thousand increase on tax. Coventry has 70 more pupils as a result of military impact. Community is faced with increased costs to provide sufficient building space for its pupils. Tiverton, 12 miles from Newport. Two years ago 4 percent of enrollment and last year 5 percent were children of parents who were affiliated with military establishments. \$15,000 more has been necessary to finance costs of education. If it had not been for Federal aid the deficit reported of \$1,700 would have been changed to \$13,500. Middletown, the most heavily hit by children of Federal employees reports that without aid from Public Law 874 it will be almost impossible for the town to finance suitable educational programs.

State department of education urges you to make every effort to influence Congress to maintain Public Law 874 at its present status. I believe that it is only fair and just that Rhode Island communities should be given at least 1 year to make adjustments in budget if there is any plan to decrease financial aid from this bill. Increased enrollments were thrust upon communities by Federal activity without sufficient time to prepare for increased enrollments.

MICHAEL F. WALSH,
Commissioner of Education, State
of Rhode Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL].

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the time allotted has been so meager.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment to the Scrivner amendment. I believe that the districts affected should have the amount restored minus the amount which the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has suggested in his amendment. I favor aid to school districts adversely affected by Federal activities. I have seen many of these districts. Also, I know the situation in regard to the delays in filing applications for entitlements in the fiscal year. Many of the districts cannot know their daily average attendance until

near May or June, practically at the end of the school session. Forty-eight and a half million dollars was spent last year and the applications are running ahead of last year at the present time. It was estimated from a survey of the additional pupils expected in the districts affected by Federal activities that they would have an increase to such an extent that an estimated \$60 million would be spent for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953. The Commissioner of Education has already received an appropriation for these activities of approximately \$40 million. So you can see the reason for the \$20 million or \$20½ million additional which is proposed in the pending amendment.

Quarrel, if you will, with the formula of the committee and denounce, if you will, the fact that they have to pro-rate equally, and also find fault with the districts included, but that is the law of the land under which the districts have made their plans. Do not penalize the children in the affected districts, who need this assistance through no fault of their own.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

(Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], a member of this 83d Congress Appropriations Subcommittee, and during the 82d Congress the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee, briefly referred to the text of a portion of the state of the Union message by the President of the United States delivered before a joint session of this 83d Congress on February 2, 1953. As this state of the Union message was no doubt a thoroughly considered, analyzed, and documented statement by our new President, we as Members of this Congress certainly have a right to assume that each and every statement, declaration, and expression therein made by him, was thoroughly considered by him before he made that speech to us. For, in it he made a few specific recommendations for legislation. One of them was on this very subject which we are this hour debating; to wit, the existing Public Law 814. As I read you this important paragraph by the President of the United States, it certainly tells us as clear as crystal, what his opinion is and what his wishes are on this subject. Therefore, I read from his speech of February 2 to us as legislators. Here is what he said:

One phase of the school problem demands special action. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 30. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

I take President Eisenhower at his word. I believe that before he made that declaration and recommendation

to us that this very public law (No. 814) should be renewed and that the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year should be met, he had his expert advisers in the field of education give him the benefit of a thorough consideration and a full knowledge of the problem involved.

Yet our own subcommittee in this Congress, within a very few days after the membership thereof had heard the President of the United States tell us what he did and ask us to renew the law and to make up the deficiency, passes us a report diametrically opposite to the recommendations of the President of the United States. This is something I do not pretend to understand. I firmly believe that when the voting time comes on the two amendments to replace this necessary sum to keep our good faith with these vital and financially embarrassed school districts all over the United States, that we will find that the recommendations of the President of the United States will be strongly supported, and, in spite of the fact that the majority membership on our subcommittee which deleted the \$24 million is of the same political party faith as is the newly inaugurated President of the United States.

I appreciate the distinguished Representative from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], and a member of the majority party, so promptly offering his amendment to replace the \$24,000,000, and if Mr. FOGARTY, the distinguished Representative from Rhode Island, had not announced that he had just talked with the Department of Education, and that they told him they could get along nicely with \$20,500,000 instead of the \$24,000,000, then I would certainly be supporting Mr. SCRIVNER's amendment. But, as Mr. FOGARTY's amendment provides for \$20,500,000 instead of the \$24 million, and is the lesser amount, and the Department of Education through him today told us that the lesser amount would be ample, therefore I support Mr. FOGARTY's amendment. May I make it clear, however, that I only vote for the lesser amount instead of the greater, because we have the assurance of the Department of Education dealing with these various school districts in the States that the amount specified in the Fogarty amendment; to wit, \$20,500,000 will do the job and will pay these concerned school districts 100 percent instead of between 50 and 60 percent of the amount represented to them they would be receiving and which they had a right to believe they would have in hand to meet the needs of their respective districts entirely, or almost entirely, as result of the Federal activities in these Federally affected areas all over our great Nation. I call your attention to page 15 of the subcommittee report on this bill, report dated February 16, 1953, at about the middle of that page it says:

Testimony and reports received by the committee leaves no doubt that there are a very great many cases where these funds go to school districts where it is obvious that local income could care for the situation.

So, having noted that paragraph, I naturally immediately looked to the printed hearings before this subcommit-

tee which made this report. And, turning to pages 251, 281, and 292 of that report, wherein the testimony by the various witnesses was recorded for our guidance and information, I frankly state that I find no testimony or record therein printed to support this statement made on page 15 of the subcommittee report to us and which we have before us today. If the chairman of our subcommittee has any such evidence to make clear the basis of this declaration by the subcommittee, to the effect that many of the local school districts have local resources to care adequately for the situations inflicted upon them because of the activity of federally controlled installations and activities in their respective school districts, then I here and now call for such evidence. I will frankly say that I know of no such condition existing in the six school districts in the great 23d District of Los Angeles County, Calif., which I

have the honor to represent. For, I have in my hand here the financial summary of the applications of 7 school districts in the 23d District now pending before the Federal Security Agency for their promised portion of the very funds about which we are speaking. This is the factual report given me in the matter. So you see, gentlemen, if the \$20½ million under the Fogarty amendment is not replaced in this bill, these 7 local school districts in my own 23d Congressional District will not only suffer a loss of estimated and planned and assured income in the amount of \$166,634.48, during the 1952-53 fiscal year; but, those local school districts, I am assured by their representatives, have not the local ability, nor have they the local resources under our California State school law to make immediately or at all available, this unexpected deficit. Here is the report which shows:

California school districts—FSA funds (for 23d Congressional District represented by Hon. Clyde Doyle)

| Project No. | Name of project | Amount paid, 1951-52 | Approximate amount of entitlement, 1952-53, 100 percent | Approximate amount of entitlement, 1952-53, 60 percent |
|----------------------|---|----------------------|---|--|
| Calif. 53-E-127..... | Compton City elementary school district..... | \$192,966.98 | \$225,771.37 | \$135,462.82 |
| 185..... | Compton Union high school district..... | 19,471.08 | 22,781.16 | 13,668.70 |
| 179..... | Lynwood unified elementary school district..... | 49,189.19 | 57,551.35 | 34,530.81 |
| 166..... | Willowbrook elementary school district..... | 30,015.00 | 35,117.55 | 21,070.53 |
| 167..... | Bellflower elementary school district..... | 16,819.00 | 19,678.23 | 11,806.94 |
| 277..... | Downey school district..... | 3,087.36 | 3,612.21 | 2,167.33 |
| 170..... | Paramount elementary school district..... | 44,508.00 | 52,074.36 | 31,244.02 |
| | Total..... | 356,056.61 | 416,586.23 | 249,951.75 |

I believe that my record during the 6 years I have had the honor and responsibility of serving in this great legislative body, proves that I have habitually been sensible of the dire need of planned economy. But I never have knowingly, and I do not believe I ever will, consider that it is sensible or sound economy to be pennywise and pound-foolish by saving the pennies out of the bodies, minds, hearts, and spirits of the American children. For, gentlemen, these children cannot speak for themselves. We are in fact the trustees for every child in America, who is affected by the Federal activities in every school district in our beloved Nation. So, Mr. Chairman, let's not think that it is economy to take away from American children the dollars absolutely necessary for them to have the help required to obtain a decent educational foundation, before they reach college age. There could be such a thing in our Nation as an era of educational illiteracy. We certainly do not want that and yet, to take away schooling opportunities from children, will naturally result in hundreds of thousands of them being to some extent, at least, illiterate and they are, therefore, bound to become less valuable, less experienced, less efficient, and less productive adult citizens.

There is no substitute for educational opportunities and training and benefits during a child's life. They are only children once and that is for a very short period in their total existence. Therefore let's not start thinking that it is economy, to take educational opportunities out of the hides of our own Ameri-

can children. Let us not exert the need we have of being economical, by jeopardizing the whole mental, physical, and spirit and economic success and happiness of millions of American children, for whom we are responsible as national legislators under the terms of this bill. I feel that I am not overspeaking or over-emphasizing this phase of education, because I had the privilege and benefit before coming to Congress for a time being a member of the California State Board of Education by appointment of his Honor, the Governor.

Not only did Mr. Bailey, of West Virginia, and his associates do a thorough study with sound results, during the 82d Congress in submitting this Public Law 814, which necessarily comes in this discussion, but I gladly joined with an overwhelming majority in this House in voting its approval. It is that law out of which, arises our good faith and pledged promises to these very school districts from which this, our subcommittee, now proposes to take this legally and morally promised \$24 million upon which these school districts have become dependent and upon which, they have made their commitments, contracts, and plans. Also, I was pleased to state in my recent campaign for a fourth term in this House, that I supported the objectives of Public Law 814. I intend to keep my promise.

These are but some of the basic reasons why I shall support the amendments. And may I emphasize again, that I am surprised and disappointed that the majority party control of this subcommittee did, so soon after President Eisen-

hower had given this Congress a definite recommendation in this very field of education, submit this \$24 million cut from the very funds, and from the very purposes and objectives which President Eisenhower himself asked be not cut in his state of the Union message. If we adopt the recommendation of the subcommittee in eliminating this sum, we fly directly in the face of President Eisenhower's express request—we will go diametrically in the opposite direction from his wishes. I say again, let us not weaken, cripple and even destroy the future physical, mental and moral factors of hundreds of thousands of American children. Yes, their posterity, too. Let us economize where it is true economy. But, it will never be a true and enduring economy, to lessen the opportunities for schooling and education in the experiences of American children. Let us not be stupid.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be used by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I supported, both by my vote and by my voice, the Bailey bill, which provided that the Federal Government should do that which it was morally obligated to do, namely, to make up the tax losses that it forced upon some of the school districts of this Nation by taking over land and property which in many instances the Government did not need, thus destroying or reducing the tax bases of these school districts and then bringing thousands of additional school children into those districts at the very time they were levying taxes for school purposes at the very highest rate permitted under State law. I have seen the impact and the results of that which has been done by the Federal Government to certain schools in my own district; for instance, those around Wright and Patterson Fields.

I believe it is the obligation and responsibility of the Federal Government when it takes taxable land away from a school district to pay their fair share of the cost of operating the schools in that district. That is what would have to be done if a privately owned industry or enterprise came into that area. It would have to pay taxes to help support the schools.

In addition to all of that, of course, we have seen thousands of additional children dumped onto those school districts which were no longer able to furnish school facilities for their own children. Yet our Government has forced many local children out of these schools—absolutely forced them out—and compelled their parents to send them to private schools.

I will compare my record for economy with any individual of this House, as far as voting for economy is concerned, but I am not going to start my efforts in behalf of economy in this 83d Congress by taking it out on a bunch of school

kids in the rural schools of Ohio. I just will not do it. We have a moral responsibility in this Congress. We passed a law—the Bailey bill—to give the schools this help in lieu of taxes. If we meant it, we ought to live up to it. If we did not, we ought not to have passed that law. We should not mislead the school districts provided for under the Bailey Act. I am not going to vote for that kind of so-called economy. If you want to repeal the whole Bailey Act, then stand up and say so. But you are going to repeal the Bailey Act, and I think you know it. To turn down this amendment is not economy, it is false economy, and would be a repudiation of our past official actions.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I just want to commend the gentleman for his statement. I am with him.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure you will also be with me when I vote for economy on many other measures in the months ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. JENSEN, by unanimous consent, yielded the time allowed to him to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].)

Mr. BUSBEY. I appreciate that, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this debate today reminds me of an everyday occurrence in our offices. We talk to a lot of people from back home who want economy and want to balance the budget and want to reduce taxes, but they want the reductions in Federal expenditures every place except where it affects them personally. I know many of you have been hearing from people back home on this subject. The pressure groups have been at work. If we are going to effect economy in this Congress, the way to do it is certainly not by restoring well justified cuts made by the Committee on Appropriations.

What did you tell the people last year in your campaign speeches? You told them you were for economy, you were for balancing the budget, and you were for reducing taxes. I say to you, "Review your campaign speeches and promises and effect them right here today by voting against this amendment."

You read in the paper this morning where the House of Delegates in the State of Maryland voted to reduce the State income tax by 15 percent. Practically every State in this Union has been reducing its indebtedness. Some of the States in the last few years have paid off every dime of their indebtedness, and one of the big reasons they have been able to do this is because they have been coming to Washington and feeding at the Federal trough. When are you going to put a stop to this? The States and the communities in this country, with very few exceptions, are able to take care of themselves. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] indicated yesterday that he thought Arlington County

needs additional Federal help for the education of its children. The Washington Times-Herald of last Sunday stated that M. T. Broyhill & Sons had built 5,000 homes in that area. Surely the gentleman is interested in more money for this area. The more money they can get from the Federal Government, the less local taxes they will have to pay. Incidentally, Arlington residents are only paying \$2.75 per hundred on a 40 percent valuation. I have here the brochure they have published regarding their schools. These schools are among the most elaborate in the United States. This situation is not unique; there are many other wealthy communities getting Federal funds under this law.

If the entire appropriation for 1953 were denied it would mean only a little over \$2 per resident of Arlington County. That would be a very small investment to get the Federal Government out of the school system.

The Chamber of Commerce of Arlington County claims they had a per capita income in 1952 of \$6,092, the highest family income in the entire United States. It is hard to believe they are unwilling to assume their responsibility. I take my hat off to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, who stood up here and said: Let us stand up and be counted as to whether we are for economy or for a continuation of ever-increasing Federal expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no distinguished record as a prophet, but I feel sure this Committee and the House as a whole is going to vote overwhelmingly to restore these funds.

I think the language contained in the report given as a reason for eliminating these funds, which in effect says that since the problem is more real and more extensive than we estimated in the beginning, we should walk out on it and surrender our obligations is a little bit ridiculous. I have in my own congressional district in Burlington County, N. J., many school districts and municipalities surrounding Fort Dix and McGuire Air Force Base, which are seriously affected by this amendment. These Federal activities not only have taken a lot of land, a lot of tax ratables away from those districts, but also they have thrust a huge load of Federal children onto them, and certainly this legislation which was passed after long and careful consideration under the auspices and good work of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is the only fair, the only legal, and moral way of dealing with this problem.

I am sure none of us wants to take that money away, penalize the school kids, and thrust an undue burden on the local school districts that they cannot possibly solve without some Federal assistance. I am sure we are all going to pass this amendment and take care of our legal and moral responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that one and a half minutes is such a short space of time and to the further fact that the majority leader has made his statement, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. EVINS yielded his time to Mr. BARDEN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Briefly; 4½ minutes is not much time.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to state that I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], that I had intended to speak on the amendment; I will not do so, however, but will content myself with extending my remarks in the RECORD at this point, make such a request, and also ask consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment.

I have a profound respect for the Appropriations Committee, but nevertheless, it is my opinion that the passing of this amendment is a necessity. It affirmatively appears to me that unless the sum named in this amendment is restored there can be no doubt that the schools in military impacted areas, who have justified their entitlements and made contracts in good faith in pursuance thereof will be reduced to 60 percent of the amount that had been determined to be necessary. Inasmuch as these contracts, already executed, are binding both in good conscience and laws, chaos will result.

Two school systems in the district which I have the privilege of representing are seriously affected. Columbus, Muscogee County, Ga., is the home of Fort Benning, the largest infantry center known to us in the world. Hundreds of children of soldiers and civilian workers from over our country are there, only because of this emergency. Columbus cannot educate them at its expense, and it should not be expected to do so. I am advised that the action of this committee will cost that school system approximately \$100,000 as it relied upon the entitlement and has outstanding contracts.

Robins Air Force Base is in Houston County. When the air field was located there the present city of Warner Robins, a city now of around 14,000 people, was a settlement of about 200 people. That area of the county was taken over by the Government and the lands are tax free. The citizens of that county find themselves with about as many people on a

Government reservation, as workers and children of defense workers, as can be found in the balance of the county. To impose upon those citizens the entire cost of educating the children of those workers can only mean bankruptcy to that county.

The citizens of Houston County, Ga., are awaiting the news of our action here with much anxiety.

In the abstract, I can understand Members who believe the added trade would make up this cost. Examined in the concrete it is entirely erroneous in many instances. Warner Robins is only a few miles from a large city in another county and district, and the two cities are connected by a four-lane highway. That large city rents most of the houses, sells most of the clothes and groceries and provides almost all of the entertainment. That large city gets almost the entire benefit arising from trade, but Houston County gets the apprehension and fear that is brought about each year when this problem comes up yearly for determination in this body. By necessity this problem should be settled with a reasonable degree of permanency.

Maybe some are getting more money than they are entitled to, but this can be, and should be determined, by survey and examination. Unless this matter is settled so that counties can understand their true positions the only alternative is for State legislative bodies to take steps to relieve such counties from the obligations imposed by compulsory school laws to educate children who are not citizens of that county and whose parents are not taxpayers, but are merely temporary sojourners for the purpose of rendering defense work. I contend that the costs of educating those children are expenses of war, just as bullets and uniforms.

Let us pass this amendment, then if it is deemed proper let some committee examine the picture and determine what areas deserve the money, and those areas which do not. Then, counties can contract with confidence and then teachers can be paid according to contract. Then, necessary buildings can be planned and erected. To proceed as the committee is doing now is not the correct way. It is actually retroactive legislation.

Let us pay our obligations by passing this amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I really was in hopes he would use his time, for I happen to know that he has in the edge of his district a tremendous operation that has virtually upset the whole tax structure of that county and jeopardizes the possibility of the operation of schools.

Getting back on the subject under discussion, let me say that this is not a Santa Claus proposition. The committee worked out a very careful formula for the distribution of these funds and the only objection to it and the only criticism the committee received at the time was that we were probably a little bit too tight with the funds.

On yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] decried the fact that we did not give Washington, D. C., any

money. What a peculiar statement to come from a member of the Appropriations Committee, and especially the chairman of the subcommittee handling this matter. The gentleman knows very well that the District of Columbia gets an appropriation every year from the Appropriations Committee. Why should we have a half dozen different appropriations coming out of the Appropriations Committee for the District of Columbia? For that reason, I was one who stood solidly and said: "No, the Appropriations Committee considers the situation in the District schools at the time they are making appropriations for the District of Columbia."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not know why the gentleman singles out the District of Columbia. It was only 1 of 15 different cities I named with a total population of 22½ million people that are not included under this program, regardless of Federal impact.

Mr. BARDEN. What a funny statement for the gentleman to make when he knows that we put a 10-percent clause in this bill to keep the big cities like Chicago and the rest of the cities named by the gentleman from coming in and making this appropriation bill a half billion dollars instead of \$20 million. Why, the gentleman knows that a city with a million population can absorb a 5-percent increase and justify it on the benefits received from the business transactions there, but when you pass the 10 percent you hit the smaller communities that are not in position to absorb it. The gentleman knows that Chicago can absorb 5 percent and up to 10 percent without it causing any hardship.

Mr. BUSBEY. This request is twice as much as the original estimate of annual cost and no one knows how much further it will go.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, the gentleman at least is satisfied with his own knowledge about the matter, but I might add neither does anyone know how many impact areas will be created by the Federal Government. There is one thing certain: The written formula passed by this Congress will govern the amount, once the condition is created by the United States Government. But let me ask the gentleman, Does he happen to know that every single school on every single military base in America, with the exception of the atomic energy plants, get their money to operate under Public 874 and the appropriation authorized by it? By what process of reasoning does the gentleman figure that we can cut the operation of a school on some big military base 40 percent and keep that school open? There is no justification for it.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is making a true statement and those particular instances should be taken care of.

Mr. BARDEN. What does the gentleman mean, I am not making a true statement?

Mr. BUSBEY. I said that is a true statement and I am for those particular areas being taken care of.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman loves them to the extent he wants to cut their heads off. He just wants to love them to death. That is what the gentleman is trying to do.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? There is something in the law with respect to what he says.

Mr. BARDEN. Now, wait a minute. The gentleman cannot tell me much about this law.

Mr. TABER. I would like to read it.

Mr. BARDEN. Here is what the department has done. The department has decided to pay those schools located on military bases 100 percent. What do you do if you take the 100 percent for those on-base schools away from the appropriation? You have the children of that portion of the military and civilian personnel who are fortunate enough to get places to live on the base with good schools while just outside the gate you have the children of the commissioned officers, sergeants, corporals, privates, and civilian employees with only a 60-percent school. It may result in even a 50- or 60-percent cut. So now, the whole practical picture is this. This is not a grab bag. The administrator does not have and does not want discretionary power to do any other than figure the formula as laid down by Congress. I do know from listening to the evidence and facts gathered by our subcommittee about conditions all over this country that this Government has established bases in little communities and imposed upon them the burden of carrying on a school for seven or eight hundred to even thousands of children, and they simply cannot do it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, does not the gentleman think the Committee on Education and Labor ought to take another look at this law, in view of the experience we have had?

Mr. BARDEN. I would love to answer that, my friend, fully, if time permitted. But I must be content with saying I think he should take at least two more looks himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

(Mr. SCHENCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I join in the amendment offered by my colleague Mr. SCRIVNER, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas. A moratorium on the growth and development can never be secured in the lives of our children. Our friends talk about a pressure group and I say to you that the most precious pressure group in this country are the children of this country.

It would be a very harsh and a very unwise act to refuse this school money. For many years I served as a teacher and as a member and president of the Board

of Education of Dayton, Ohio. This experience has perhaps given me a very acute sense of the value of education. But this regard, or perhaps even reverence, for our ideal of free public education goes beyond my own personal experience. I need not point out that we in America, from the inception of our national life, have always held that system a cornerstone of our development. May we always continue to do so. True there are many extremely urgent programs already undertaken and to be undertaken by this Congress. No doubt our most disturbing problem is to assign to each its proper place in the scale of necessity and priority within the limits of our national abilities. Notwithstanding the difficulty of that task, I will hold always with this ideal of free public education. This even along with other pressing demands in the field of defense spending because I regard our greatest strength to lie in maintaining a high level of education among our American youth.

No one, with open eyes, can deny that this is a period of emergency for our schools, and this condition exists throughout every State. In certain areas, those here considered, this emergency has been raised to a critical phase solely by the national-defense effort. It is a Federal problem and must, in fairness, be treated as such. This was the logic of the Federal support program. It was and is sound logic. Conditions have not changed except to become more critical and we cannot falter in that program now. To do so could have only one result, to imperil the rights of these children to receive one of the finest things we as a Nation attempt to offer all our children, and that is, simply, a good education.

To emphasize these general considerations I want to call to your attention certain facts. While I am not familiar, of course, with all these federally impacted areas, I have, both as a Representative to Congress from the Third Ohio District and as former president of the Dayton, Ohio, school board, learned fully the conditions existing in several of these school districts in the locality surrounding Wright Patterson Air Force Base. I think a discussion of the plight of one of these, Mad River Township, will show how desperately these funds are needed. Mad River Township comprises 6 schools adjoining Wright Patterson Air Force Base where there are employed 32,000 civilians and several thousand military personnel. This district now has a total of 3,100 Lanham Act and Wherry Act housing units either completed or under construction. The purpose of this housing is to house the defense employees. This housing is tax-exempt but the laws of the State of Ohio say that the children of these parents must have equal school opportunity. In addition, there are 765 privately constructed dwellings being erected within the school district. In 1941 there were 692 elementary-school children in this district. In 1952 there are 2,756. As you know, the major support of the school

program ordinarily comes from real-estate taxes levied against taxable property in the district. There are 17 school districts in Montgomery County. The amount of taxable property in the duplicate now behind each pupil and based on a recent general reappraisal varies in these school districts from a high of \$16,234 to a low of \$3,440, and this low figure is for Mad River Township. School enrollment is four times as high as it was in 1941. This contrasts with the general county increase of two times. Over 50 percent of all the people in the school district live on tax-exempt property. Recently the schools have been operating on a double-shift basis.

A new 1,000-unit Wherry Act project is being constructed within the district at this very time. This will bring approximately 1,000 more children into the district, who will become the responsibility of this already overburdened school board.

This almost unsolvable problem has been created by two things: One, the enormous increase in the birth rate occasioned by World War II, and two, the immigration of these thousands of persons to work for Wright Patterson Air Force Base and defense industries. Under no circumstances can it be forecast that this condition will be alleviated within the next few years. On the contrary, it is most probable, as population studies indicate, that the peak years have not yet been reached.

What clearer picture, what more convincing demonstration for the need for these moneys can be made? The proposed deletion of these funds from the supplemental appropriation bill will mean a loss to the Mad River Township school district of \$53,000. Without a doubt it would mean a loss of teachers, a lowering of standards, a double shift half-time school program for these thousands of children, and, in short, completely inadequate discharge of our public responsibility to them. Once again may I emphasize what I conceive to be the controlling reasons for approving these moneys. The need is clear and uncontroversial. While I have used the Mad River Township School District in Montgomery County, Ohio, to illustrate the very pressing need for these Federal funds, the same situation applies to the other school districts in accordance with their demonstrated need. The goal is one most cherished and constantly to be sacrificed for. The responsibility lies clearly with the Federal Government and the defense effort. The local people are doing their part and are doing it splendidly. To fail, not to help them but to discharge our clear duty to them, would be to take a course which we cannot in good conscience pursue. With all the earnestness of which I am capable, I most respectfully urge that these funds be approved. As an illustration of the seriousness of this situation and the effect of the deletion of these necessary funds for our public schools in one county of the Third District of Ohio, I am placing in the RECORD herewith a tabulation of this school program.

| Project No. | Project name | 1951-52 entitlement | 1952-53 estimated entitlement at 100 per- cent | 1952-53 estimated entitlement at 60 per- cent |
|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|--|---|
| 1 | Mad River | \$138,185.94 | \$165,823.13 | \$99,493.88 |
| 3 | Dayton | 223,684.33 | 268,421.20 | 161,052.72 |
| 5 | Butler Township, Vandalia | 52,292.52 | 62,751.02 | 37,650.61 |
| 10 | Northridge | 59,546.92 | 71,456.30 | 42,873.78 |
| 20 | Vau Buren | 38,874.92 | 46,649.90 | 27,989.94 |
| 21 | Wayne | 1,336.86 | 1,609.23 | 962.54 |
| 25 | Miamisburg | 5,854.38 | 7,025.26 | 4,215.16 |
| 29 | Washington Township, Centerville | 7,313.30 | 8,775.96 | 5,265.58 |
| 37 | Randolph Township, Englewood | 15,069.23 | 18,093.08 | 10,849.85 |
| | Total | 542,158.40 | 650,590.08 | 390,354.06 |

(Mr. RILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.)

[Mr. RILEY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, those of us who have the honor to represent defense areas were greatly relieved by the state of the Union message delivered by President Eisenhower to the House on February 2, 1953. The assurances that school districts which have been affected by the expansion of Federal defense activities would receive fair and adequate consideration from this administration was contained in two paragraphs of the President's message as follows:

Our school system demands some prompt, effective help. During each of the last 2 years, more than 1½ million children have swelled the elementary and secondary school population of the country. Generally, the school population is proportionately higher in States with low per capita income. This whole situation calls for careful congressional study and action. I am sure that you share my conviction that the firm conditions of Federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income.

One phase of the school problem demands special action. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 30. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

Our confidence was short lived, however, by the action of the Appropriations Committee in disallowing the entire request of \$24 million to provide funds for operation and maintenance of schools located in federally affected areas as provided by Public Law 874. We, in Alabama, are especially disturbed by this action because it leaves us in an almost helpless condition as far as providing means of education for the children of defense workers and military personnel in these affected areas. It is a well-known fact that the States in the southeast, and especially Alabama, have never received a fair share of these funds. I quote from a statement submitted on

February 7, 1953, to the Alabama delegation in Congress, by N. F. Nunnelle, chairman for Federally Affected School Systems in Alabama, and C. L. Martin, member of National Committee on Legislation for Federally Affected Areas:

At the present time county school systems in Alabama receive less than \$15 for each federally connected child, while other school systems receive more than \$100 for each federally connected child. All school systems should receive a minimum of at least 75 percent of the national average local expenditure per child.

Most of the defense plants in Alabama are concentrated in the Fourth District, which I have the high honor to represent. At one installation, and I speak of the Anniston Ordnance Depot, at Bynum, Ala., we have practically doubled the number of personnel since the outbreak of the war in Korea. Many of the families live on the installation and, therefore, have no taxable property which is subject to a school district tax. This same situation applied to Fort McClellan, Ala., and to Craig Air Force Base in Selma, Ala., where many of the defense workers and military personnel live on the reservation.

I feel that the Federal emergency is just as great as it has ever been and that to neglect the education of these children who have no choice about where they are to live will not only be unfair to my section of the country but is a shortsighted, pennywise and pound-foolish policy which must be corrected. I do not believe that it is in keeping with the President's views as outlined in his State of the Union Message, and I cannot believe that such a policy can result in anything but a weakening of our national preparedness program.

I have lived near a military installation all of my life and I know from my contacts with military people and people in defense work that the morale of these people is highly important. Good relations with the local communities and school authorities can only be maintained when the proper attention is given to the health, education, and welfare of the people who, because of circumstances beyond their control, are forced to live and work in communities not always of their own selection. I believe in economy and I feel that there are many places in the Federal Government where we can do a lot of needed trimming; but to strike at the schoolchildren of America and to strike at communities which are already overburdened because of defense activities is not economy.

Some will say when a military installation is located in an area many great benefits follow from such projects. I would like to point out that I have seen 2 or 3 of these projects come to my district. While it is true that these defense installations add to the population and perhaps there are commercial benefits which are worth while as far as the merchants, contractors, construction workers, and professional people are concerned, yet there are also many problems connected with these activities. The cities and counties affected must increase the personnel of their health and sanitation departments, additional men must be added to the police and law enforcement staff, and additional firemen must be added. In addition to these heavy expenses, some of the projects call for other expansions in municipal and county facilities. Four of the cities in my district which have recently experienced such additional expenses are the cities of Anniston, Talladega, Oxford, and Selma. Since the expansion of Fort McClellan and Anniston Ordnance Depot, the city of Anniston has been required to spend almost a million dollars for expansion of water facilities. The same thing is true of the cities of Oxford and Talladega, the latter city having spent almost one-half million dollars in the expansion of its water system. As far as I have been able to find out not one cent of Federal money was available to these cities for these heavy expenditures. Many of the cities have had to build new streets and additional sewerage facilities and these expansions have been made without any help from the Federal Government.

It is a well-known fact that local governments are receiving a very small portion of the tax revenues of the country. In fact, most of it is coming to Washington. I do not understand the philosophy of those who say to these cities and counties that you must assume the additional cost of educating children brought to these communities by the immigration of defense workers and military personnel. I think the policy which has been followed in Public Law 874 for the past 3 years must be continued if we are to do a good job of educating the future citizens of America—its school children.

In addition to all other arguments, it seems to me that there is a moral obligation because of the fact that 60 percent of these funds have been appropriated beginning in fiscal 1953. Plans for carrying out school activities are usually made at the end of the school term, looking to the next school year. These schools had no reason to believe that they would not receive the amount called for in the supplemental appropriation. They made contracts with teachers, they arranged for the necessary physical equipment including heat, lights, and water, and it seems to me that this is very late in the game to deny these funds after the major portion of the expenses has been obligated. You simply do not make contracts by the month, and I do not believe that this Congress will refuse to carry out what to me is stronger than a legal obligation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will show by its action today that the membership is in accord with the President when he "demanded special action" in those areas which have felt the heavy impact of defense activities. I do not believe that the membership of this House is ready to embark on a policy which denies the Federal Government the responsibility of seeing to it that the children of America do not suffer because of circumstances beyond their control.

(Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. RILEY, and Mr. ROBERTS asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. COLMER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I shall take the time that my colleagues have so generously yielded me, because I think it is very obvious from what has happened here this morning that this amendment will carry overwhelmingly. Therefore, I shall not trespass upon the time of the Committee of the Whole at length.

Mr. Chairman, permit me, if I may, in all sincerity, to say that I am as interested in balancing this budget as any Member in this House, and I think my record here will demonstrate that. But I also want to be on record to this effect: We have heard a great deal in the past, and I have heard it many times when I offered amendments on this floor to cut appropriations, that this was a meat-ax approach. Well, if I ever saw a meat-ax approach to a problem, it is certainly in this instance. Now, what happens? By one fell swoop the committee would cut 40 percent from the terms that these schools operate. That is exactly what it would amount to in most instances.

I have a great deal of sympathy with the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in their efforts to try to make reductions, but I cannot go along with that type of approach to the proposition. I so outlined it to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, when he appeared before the Committee on Rules and pointed out the difficulty of this type of cut. I prophesied to him then that if he insisted on this procedure that the whole amount would be restored on the floor.

You either have to break faith, on the one hand, with these children and these school communities or you must, in the future, change your formula. Certainly the fair and honorable thing is to keep your commitment now and change the formula for next year.

I am absolutely convinced that this thing has grown too much. I was interested in what the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois said about it. I think it has mushroomed too much. I can see no reason why the city of Washington, or any other city of comparable size, should come under the provisions of this bill, when it affects their budget such a fractional percent. But if you take a small com-

munity in the State of my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], or in my own State, a small community where the impact has been tremendous, many hundred percent, those communities cannot absorb it, because, as the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out here a moment ago, some of those communities are taxing themselves to their constitutional limitations in providing for their school budgets.

I hope the appropriate committee will look into this thing and try to evolve a new formula for next year by changing the basic law so that reductions can be made.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. May I compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he has made. I represent many of the school districts which are located within the Savannah River atomic-energy plant. I am afraid some of these schools will have to be closed unless one of these amendments is adopted.

Mr. COLMER. I think the gentleman's attitude is correct. I am sure that many of these schools would be forced to close if the necessary funds are not restored. I am confident they will be restored here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Scrivner amendment. This amendment is identical with the one which I had already placed on the Clerk's desk. Its effect, if adopted, would be to restore the sum of \$24 million to the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for payments to school districts, which was deleted by the committee from the request for supplemental appropriations.

I support this amendment because by doing so I believe I am keeping the pledge made by myself to the people of my congressional district. I also believe I am keeping the pledge made to the American people on February 2, 1953, by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message.

In order that the record may be made clear, I quote a significant paragraph from the President's message. I read his exact words:

One phase of the school problem demands special action. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 30. This law should be renewed, and, likewise, and this is most important, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

I would state for the information of the Committee that this amendment affects 16 separate localities in the State of Connecticut. I place the list in the RECORD at this point. Of this number, four lie within the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. I also add that the town of Groton, Conn.,

within my district, has the most serious problem facing any of the towns in our entire State.

In the Groton and New London area are located the United States Coast Guard Academy, the United States Coast Guard Training Station, the United States Naval Submarine Base, the United States Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory. In addition to these Government installations we have the General Dynamics Corporation, which, as you know, is presently building the first atomic-powered submarine. Extensive portions of this plant are Government owned and completely tax exempt. This area is definitely a defense area.

Public Law 874, approved September 30, 1950, authorized Federal financial assistance in meeting the operating expenses of schools in districts overburdened by Federal activities.

Under the major provisions of this law, payments are made toward current school expenses of communities in which 3 percent or more of the children attending school reside on Federal property or live with parents employed on Federal property, or both, or in which there has been a sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as a result of Federal activities. The amounts of payment are based on the total average daily attendance of applicable children for the year in varying percentages of the contribution rate determined by the cost per pupil from local sources in comparable school districts within the State.

An appropriation of \$40 million for this purpose was carried in the Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1953. This amount was based upon an estimate made before the beginning of the current school year. It presumed that approximately 1,400 school districts would be eligible for assistance in the fiscal year 1953.

In view of the defense activity it now appears that over 2,300 school districts will be eligible for assistance under the law and that the average payments will be larger than originally estimated because of an increase in enrollment.

The current amount of \$40 million is sufficient to pay only about 60 percent of the amounts to which the eligible school districts are entitled under the law. This means a cutback of 40 percent in the amounts to which local communities have had a right to expect as Federal income for operation of their schools. True, as was stated in the committee hearings, they were notified in the late fall that this cutback would be necessary, but this is small comfort to school districts which simply cannot operate for the full year without full payment; and, in any event budgets, including estimated income, for 1952-53 had to be prepared and tax rates for net local costs set well before July 1. If my towns cannot budget with confidence under the provisions of Public Law 874, much of its value is lost. To the town of Groton, this cutback means \$80,000, 2½ mills on its grand list to be made up another year, plus further additional local cost to be figured in for that year because of lack of confidence that the Federal obligation will be met in full.

The committee in charge of this appropriation stated in the committee report, on page 15, and I quote, that—

Testimony and reports received by the committee leaves no doubt that there are a very great many cases where these funds go to school districts where it is obvious that local income could care for the situation.

I respectfully disagree with that statement—at least as far as it applies to those projects in my own State with which I am familiar. If it is true that some communities could by extra effort take care of the situation—and certainly this is not the case in the town of Groton—why penalize the great majority of heavily burdened communities in order to keep from paying the few too much? The way to correct such a situation, I believe, is to amend the basic law beginning with the next fiscal year.

In the town of Groton, Conn., 50.2 percent of the property within the township is owned by the Federal Government. This property is not only tax exempt, but has no payments in lieu of taxes made on it whatsoever. Four and one-half percent of the property in the town is owned by the Federal Government on which payments in lieu of taxes are made. On this land are constructed the housing projects so desperately needed by the families of the servicemen and defense workers who have been called into the area. In this connection I might add that the amount paid in lieu of taxes is well below the normal yield per residence.

In recent years the school population has approximately doubled. During that same period of time the adult population has shown the same growth. It is my understanding that the General Dynamics Corp. is still continuing its program of expansion and additional workers are moving into the community every day.

I would remind the Committee that of the approximately 4,300 school children in the Groton school system over 1,700 of them live on Federal property. As regards this latter figure, an increase of over 400 is anticipated for the beginning of the next school year.

I would remind the Committee that the naval authorities are earnestly seeking to provide suitable living quarters for the families of over 2,000 service personnel. This will result in an even further increase in the school population to be cared for in this general area.

I would further remind the Committee that as a result of this condition whereby over 50 percent of the property of the town of Groton is not only tax exempt but has no payments made on it whatsoever in lieu of taxes, the taxable wealth per pupil in school is just a little over \$7,000, as compared to an average for the State of above \$16,000.

I most earnestly urge the Committee to support the Scrivner amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from West Virginia is the author of the basic law under which this appropriation rises, I ask unanimous consent that the time

allotted to me may be assigned to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, as author of Public Law 871 may I say to my colleagues in the House that it is sound, sensible legislation, and should be supported by adequate funds so long as it remains on the statute books. Let me explain why this was bad economy on the part of the subcommittee to slash the \$24 million from the supplemental appropriation bill. Let me say to you that the Office of Education has worked out on a matching basis with the several school districts surrounding a federally-owned base whereby those pupils or families living on the base are permitted to attend schools in the surrounding school district, and they get the advantage of the State aid fund that goes toward the support of the State school there. If you fall down on this proposition and fail to make this money available, instead of carrying out the education of these on-base pupils under section 204 of Public Law 874, we will have to go over to section 6. That will entail the building of costly school facilities on base to take care of these on-base pupils. That would cost you \$5 million more to administer under section 6 than it will to administer it under section 204 as the Office of Education is now administering it. I cannot understand why this subcommittee that had charge of the appropriations for labor and Federal security in the amount of \$406 million were able to trim out of that \$32,137,000 and of that \$24 million had to be at the expense of the boys and girls. That was in the face of the fact that there is not only legal but a moral obligation on the part of the Congress to take care of the Government's responsibility. As author of that bill, may I say to you that the bill requires the Government to pay as a result of the damage done by the impact which the Government forced upon these districts by building these Federal installations. It is a fair piece of legislation. I want to insist as author of this legislation that it has worked satisfactorily, and it will continue to work satisfactorily. I do not say that the bill should not be changed. There is pending in the Committee on Education and Labor, or at least there was in the last session of the Congress, legislation to rewrite it and I assume my committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania later in this session of the Congress will rewrite Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 because the Congress continues to make provisions for building, let us say, as we did in Ohio a few months ago when we authorized a \$2 billion atomic energy plant in territory where there is not anything that looks like a school building. The people are pouring into that territory which is in the district of my colleague, Mr. POLK, and Mr. JENNINGS, in Portsmouth. They are pouring into that territory by the thousands. Less than a week or two weeks ago you authorized another big installation for

atomic energy in Illinois. So there is no possibility so long as the Congress continues to provide for the erection of these federally-owned bases of that kind for these districts to carry on their work properly.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to mention that not a single school of this type is in the Third Congressional District of West Virginia, which I have the honor to represent, and there is only one small school in the entire State of West Virginia of that type.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I commend the gentleman for his position on this question. Without question the House should restore these funds which are essential for the proper continued operation of schools in districts whose population is increased by Federal activities.

There is no other way in which the children affected by this legislation can receive the measure of education now planned for them. In many instances that measure of education is inadequate. We would be exercising poor judgment indeed should be fail to restore these funds.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

(Mr. KEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Further, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] for his fine stand on this particular piece of legislation. I, too, like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], can say that my voting record on economy would be beyond any reproach. However, this legislation is needed and desired.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] who headed the subcommittee in the 81st Congress, did a fine job. It seems to me the House should be complimented to know that we have a man who was willing to take the time that he did to investigate so that we could come in here and act in good faith, knowing that the committee did a good job. Further, they did not make this inspection by airplane, either. They covered the ground. They walked around and they visited the schoolhouses. They talked to school boards. They found out the need was there.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I certainly wish to thank the gentleman for his remarks and say that I considered it a service that was due me as a Member of this House, as one who has the welfare of our boys and girls at heart.

Mr. KEARNS. I am sure that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Scrivner amendment to restore the \$24 million Federal payment to communities for schools which have been affected by the impact of extensive Federal operations in their areas.

I would like to have offered that amendment myself, but I understand the procedure of the House is that a member of the committee reporting the bill is recognized for such purposes first.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] saw fit to use the community of Arlington, Va., which is in my congressional district, as a guinea pig. I am happy he did that, because I like to talk about one of my communities. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] said that he could not see why Arlington County should receive one dime of Federal assistance. I will tell you why it should. I believe if the gentleman from Illinois represented the 10th District of Virginia, he would be here telling you why. Right across the Potomac River is the Pentagon Building. That is the building that is so large that messengers are said to have been lost for weeks at a time. How much tax do you think the Federal Government pays on that? Not a dime. Then there is also the National Airport and the Arlington Cemetery and the Naval Annex and Fort Myer and several other locations for which Arlington County does not receive any taxes whatsoever from Uncle Sam. Over one-sixth of the area of Arlington County is federally owned. And that is not wasteland or marshland or desert land. That is the most valuable land we have in Arlington County. If the federally owned property there was included on the Arlington County tax rolls for assessment purposes, it would exceed 50 percent of the total value. The tax revenue Arlington received from real property taxes amounted to about \$6 million. It was estimated by the Commissioner of Revenue yesterday morning that if the property owned by the Federal Government were owned by private industry, which would have to pay taxes, the community of Arlington would have received over \$7 million in additional taxes last year and every year.

The fact that the Federal Government is operating on this property necessitates additional expenses on the part of the community to provide sufficient streets and highways, police and fire protection, water and sewerage, and other community facilities surrounding this property, not mentioning schools. These expenditures would not be necessary if the property occupied by the Federal Government was wasteland and not being used. In addition to the loss of revenue by virtue of the federally owned property, the operations themselves cause a large number of transit employees to be living temporarily in the community long enough to enjoy community facilities, including schools, but not long enough to be assessed for personal property and State income taxes. This is

particularly true in the case of military personnel who are exempt by Federal law under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act from payment of local personal property taxes, automobile license taxes, and State income taxes. All of the taxes are used in the local school program.

There are, no doubt, many Members of Congress residing in this community who have children attending the local schools. We are very happy to have you with us. I am very happy to have you as my temporary constituents; and if I can be of any service to you, drop by and see me. However, you must realize that by being a temporary resident, you do not assume your proper share of local taxes. The only tax that you pay in Arlington by either renting or owning a home is the real property tax which is only a small portion of our local tax revenue.

We do not feel that the Federal Government owes our community any assistance for the permanent employees residing there; on the contrary, they make the best citizens, and the fact that there are so many permanent Federal employees residing in Arlington makes Arlington one of the top communities insofar as intellectual background, standard of living, and government operations is concerned. We have less crime and slum area in Arlington per capita than any other community in the country, all of which bears out that Federal employees as such are an asset rather than a liability to any community in which they reside and become permanent legal residents.

The obligation that the Federal Government has is not because of the permanent residents but because the transient employees that move into an area in which there is large Federal operation.

I repeat, since the Federal Government does not pay taxes on the property that it owns and causes an unusual growth of non-tax-paying residents in our local population, I feel that it has an obligation to the community to offer some assistance in the community school problems. This should not be looked upon as a handout but merely as a payment of a portion of its obligation.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] commented on the fact that the total assessed valuation of the property in Arlington has increased. This is, of course, obviously true due to two factors: First, there has been an increase in value of all property due to inflation and, second, Arlington is a rapidly growing community and new homes are being constructed every day to take care of the rapidly growing Federal Government operations in this area. There again, however, the mere fact that the Federal Government is not paying its portion of its obligation to the community in its growth causes the tax rate of the citizens to be unreasonable and has necessitated a large bonded indebtedness in Arlington which has almost reached the statutory limit. If the Federal Government had paid a larger share of its obligation, such indebtedness would not have been necessary. I do hope that the House will see fit to vote for the amendment and thereby prevent

the Federal Government from welching on part of its obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(Mr. BROYHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I doubt that it should be necessary to discuss the merits or demerits of the so-called Bailey bill. The House went through that matter quite thoroughly when it had the original legislation under consideration. It was after very long and studious consideration and study that the committee approved the bill, and the House thereafter approved it. That legislation set out a formula under which applications have been filed and estimates made. We are now informed that pursuant to the estimates we will require an additional \$24 million to meet them.

The House has spoken on the matter. I do not know why we should consider the merits of the legislation which is now public law. The only question is: Are we going to meet the formula and meet the estimates which have been set up? I feel that if the House fails to approve this \$24 million item we would be breaking faith with the people who had a right to and did rely upon the legislation which does exist. These school districts have obligated themselves by their employment contracts, by their purchases of school material and books; and if we fail to appropriate this money many will go into the red. They had a right to rely on existing legislation, and I think we fail in our duty if we do not provide the money we obligated ourselves under previous legislation to appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment. I was one of the members of the subcommittee that made this study in the 81st Congress. I remember visiting an impacted area around Fort Knox where approximately 80 children were in one schoolroom which was suitable for 25.

There is no doubt that this is a just obligation to take care of these impacted areas, and I am glad to see the membership of the committee here today manifest such great interest in approaching this problem with a view of restoring the appropriation.

I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] on his presentation of the problem involved here.

There has been no persuasive argument made against the restoration of this fund. The Federal Government has always been in the school business. Even

before our present Constitution was adopted, the Congress of the Confederation set aside public lands in the Northwest Territory for the endowment of the common schools. In the early 1800's, 20's and 30's, and on up through the century, as States were admitted to the Union, this Congress continued to set aside public lands for school purposes. We ought to go one step further and pass a general Federal aid to education bill, in order that we may assist the elementary and secondary schools in the poorer States where in general the birth rate is the highest and economic conditions are the poorest. We find in these areas that the States and local governments are making greater efforts and spending more of their per capita incomes than many of the wealthier States; and at the same time, educational levels are lowest. At least we should avail ourselves of the opportunity to alleviate these conditions in our schools when we vote in the "Off-shore Oil" proposals.

Mr. Chairman, in Kentucky alone, approximately 30 counties are affected by this legislation, and 50 school districts. The school authorities have made up their budgets with the idea of obtaining a 100 percent entitlement. Failure to restore this appropriation would mean that the school people in Kentucky affected by this legislation would lose more than \$400 thousand. To now deprive them of \$2 out of every \$5 that was originally anticipated would certainly be a grave injustice from the standpoint of the welfare of all the children in these areas. The same is true throughout the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GOLDEN].

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was tremendously interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas when he said he felt the rules, regulations, and formula governing this bill could be rewritten and improved. I was likewise impressed and pleased to hear the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia in which he said that continued study of this situation was being had by the subcommittee, and that certain rules, regulations, and formulas may be adopted by the present Congress to include other needed school districts. Those remarks give me some hope that a situation in my home district in Kentucky may be included in this very beneficial program. They have been operating on what they call the county-unit basis, but many of the counties I have the honor to represent do not have a great increase in the overall number of pupils in any one county. The Federal Government has gone into my district and created a great dam and a great lake more than 100 miles long. It has flooded out dozens and scores of school districts which have required those school pupils to go to the county seats of several counties and overcrowd them. This has greatly increased the attendance in those county-seat schools and they do not have sufficient room or facilities to take care of them. Also the Government has greatly reduced the amount of taxes going to the school dis-

tricts, as well as to the counties themselves, by taking many thousands of acres of good land which is now tax-free.

This situation should be met and taken care of by the appropriate committee rewriting the formula by which this money is allocated to the schools.

Before my time to speak is up, I want to sincerely compliment the Appropriations Committee for their overall work on this supplemental appropriation bill. They have saved the taxpayers more than a billion dollars—whether this amendment is passed. They are to be congratulated.

(Mr. GOLDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, the situation in my district, which is the Sixth District of Maryland immediately adjacent to Washington starting with Montgomery County, is very similar to that which exists in Arlington, about which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] spoke. I am not familiar with taxes in Virginia, but I know that in Montgomery County the taxes are rapidly approaching the breaking point and the bond issues for school and other purposes are rapidly reaching the point that the bond investors consider dangerous.

The gentleman from Illinois mentioned something about an action taken by the Maryland Legislature. I was a member of the Maryland Legislature and we attempted to find a solution to the problem by passing special tax laws to enable local school districts, which happen to be counties, in Maryland to raise revenue from sources other than taxes on revenue. That legislation worked very well for some counties, but for counties like Montgomery and Prince Georges County it was totally ineffective because there was no business or industry there from which to collect anything that would be made available by such legislation. The business in those areas which brings the people in is the business of Government. I say that perhaps one solution to the problem, if some gentlemen want to get the Federal Government out of local affairs, with which I am heartily in accord, is to start cutting down on the Federal Government's activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

(Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I propose to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]. I think that if we have less money than \$24,000,000 we probably would be confronted with another bill for additional money.

This restoration, in my opinion, is meeting an obligation made by this Congress in a bill signed by the President of the United States, which became law. The present President of the United

States concurs in this activity. It is wrong to make an agreement with respect to funds, then violate that agreement.

It has been said here that several cities were not going to get any of this money. I want to assure you that the State of New Mexico which I represent in this House did not ask that one of the largest areas in the United States be taken over by the Army as a proving ground for guided missiles, located at Alamogordo, N. Mex., where the first atomic bomb was exploded, an area comprising about 90 by 30 miles. I do not think Chicago would want that project, nor do I think any of the other cities want it. There are few places that could have a project of that kind. The ranchers on the project did not want it. So the Federal Government went into the courts, condemned the land and took over.

As a result thousands of children came there to go to school. We welcomed them because they came to a State where health is one of the great assets. We are happy to have the children, but very unfortunately we cannot provide the money to take over an impact of that kind so quickly. I think to deny an education to those children is criminal.

If this amendment is not adopted the people of the country have every right to accuse us of bad faith. The committee report actually repudiates an agreement the Congress made 2 years ago; an agreement which the school districts affected accepted in good faith and have, since that time, adjusted their financial arrangements in the belief that the promised Federal payments would be forthcoming in accordance with the terms of Public Law 874. We gave our word. Now we are asked by the committee to break it. I, for one, cannot be a party to that.

I do not impugn the motives of the committee. Apparently it is seeking to make a record of some sort for what it thinks to be economy. There are a thousand places in this widespread governmental structure of ours where sound economy can and must be practiced, but this is not one of them.

It means the difference between education or ignorance for thousands of children. It seems inconceivable that this action could have been taken had the committee understood the purpose of Congress in enacting that legislation.

Reference was made by the committee to the increase in the number of school districts which received aid during the war and to those who are receiving aid under the provisions of Public Law 874. The Lanham Act provided for deficit financing and assisted only those school districts which were unable to provide a reasonable level of education without Federal assistance. Public Law 874 had a different motive. Over the years 17 different Federal agencies have been authorized to provide educational assistance for the children of Federal employees. Public Law 874 represented a constructive overall approach to discharge the obligation of the Federal Government resulting from the acquisition of large amounts of real property with the consequent reduction of the tax

base of the school districts and an influx of children who were dependents of Federal employees. The cost to the Federal Government is a very small proportion of the amount which would be required to pay the regular assessed school taxes if the federally acquired property had remained in private hands.

Whether this law was or was not unwise in all its provisions is not the issue today. Congress assumed the Federal responsibility stated in Public Law 874 over 2 years ago. It cut off all other forms of Federal aid. The school districts involved have adjusted their financial arrangements with the assurance that the Federal payments would be forthcoming in accordance with the provisions of the law. School districts were assisted in the education of 716,380 children in the last year and an increase of about 25 percent is estimated for the current school year. If the \$24,000,000 requested is not appropriated, schools for these children must be closed and teachers' contracts must be canceled at the expiration of the first two-thirds of the school year.

There are many school districts throughout the United States, boundaries of which are coextensive with the reservation of a Federal housing project. They have no other means of raising school funds. To fail to appropriate this money will not only mean that the school year will be cut short but also that the school districts will be in debt for the unexpired term of teachers' contracts and will be severely handicapped in conducting school next year.

The committee report cites one reason for its action which should be ample proof that the committee started with the wrong premise and, consequently, could not reach a sound conclusion. The report states that less than 500 districts received assistance at the peak of World War II and that now 2,300 are receiving it. It could have gone even further back than it did and cite the fact that none received assistance during the Revolutionary War. That would be just as germane to the question at issue here.

In my own State of New Mexico, for instance, the Federal impact due to the defense program is easily three times that during World War II. Millions of dollars worth of property, once on the tax rolls, has been acquired by the Government and the tax payments have ceased. At the same time thousands of children of immigrating Federal defense workers have swelled the school population to the point where there are neither facilities nor money available to educate them. Who is responsible for that? The Federal Government, of course. The Congress recognized that when Public Law 874 was passed. Now we are asked to repudiate that agreement with the people of the school districts from whom we have taken tax income and added to their cost of educating the children. In some cases that cost has been doubled by activities of the Federal Government.

I am for every sound economy that can be exercised to save dollars for the taxpayers, but I am not for the false economy that requires the Congress and

the Federal Government to break just and equitable commitments that have been made and accepted in good faith.

This amendment should be adopted—and unanimously.

I would like to take this occasion to say a word of appreciation for the fine contribution made by my esteemed colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] to the support of this amendment. He has made a long and careful study of this subject and I share with many other Members of the House a profound respect for his knowledge and understanding of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Scrivener amendment on three different points. When I ran for Congress last fall, I had three planks in my platform. One was that I would do all things possible to prevent the completion of Tuttle Creek Dam, and it looks now as if I will be able to keep that campaign promise. Another was that I favored legislation that would make graft on the part of government officials, especially those in the National Government, so dangerous that no person would consider engaging in it. I believe the Republican majority on my left would do well to help me keep that promise. The third plank was that I favored eliminating all unnecessary items from the budget and cutting Government expenses to the bone. My support of the amendment is not contrary to that promise. I was impressed by the statement of the gentleman who said that he was not in favor of curtailing appropriations at the expense of the children. I want to say that I am not in favor of curtailing Government appropriations at the expense of the honor of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as this law is now written, the Congress is morally obligated to fulfill its commitments to the schools throughout the United States of America whose budgets were predicated on our promised support. That there are inequalities in the present bill there is no doubt, but the honor of the Congress of the United States is at stake. The obligation is not alone to the citizens and school children of the districts affected. All the people of the United States expect Congress to honor its commitments. I am confident the proposed amendment will be adopted. I submit the following letter from the State superintendent of public instruction of Kansas:

KANSAS STATE
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Topeka, Kans., February 11, 1953.
Representative HOWARD S. MILLER,
Kansas First Congressional District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Since Kansas will have more than 150 school districts making application for Federal assistance funds under the provisions of Public Law 874, I am anxious to submit facts and figures so that each Kansas Congressman and Senator will have firsthand information with reference to the Federal assistance program as it is now operating.

This is the third year for the operation of Public Law 874. During the first year, Kansas had 26 districts making application and

the total receipts for these districts amounted to \$967,954.27. Last year we had 121 districts qualifying and receiving \$2,007,519.32; and for the current year, we have reason to believe that there will be close to 160 school districts that will make application.

These districts are listed on the attached sheets with estimated entitlements for the districts that have already applied for the 1952-53 school year plus the districts that applied last year that have not applied thus far this year and those that have not as yet made applications under Public Law 874. Applicant schools that have not applied prior to this year and have not as yet submitted their application are listed with no estimated entitlements.

The schools have been arranged according to counties and congressional districts with subtotals by congressional districts. The total of the listed estimated entitlements is \$2,381,735.83. We believe that the total entitlements for the current year will eventually be close to \$2½ million.

We have been informed that the last session of the Congress appropriated \$40 million to take care of the applicant schools under Public Law 874 for the 1952-53 school year. Since school costs are increasing each year and the defense program is being stepped up each year, it is obvious that the total amount needed to meet the entitlements would increase from year to year.

The entitlements in Kansas this year will show about 20-percent increase over that of last year. The total amount provided for the program during the 1951-52 school year was \$51,700,000, and we are informed that the estimates made by the United States Office of Education indicate that it will take approximately \$64 million to meet the entitlements in full for the current school year. The \$40 million already appropriated for the current year will take care of only approximately 60 percent of the entitlements.

I am sure that you are aware that boards of education must plan 18 months in advance for funds to operate schools in Kansas. Boards of education must enter into contracts with teachers, and the school district is obligated to meet these contracts in full payment. Therefore, I respectfully request that serious consideration be given to the deficiency appropriation of \$20 million, which would make sufficient funds available to take care of the school districts' entitlements in full.

I am frank to say that every school board in the districts that have Federal impacts expect the Federal Government to meet its obligations in connection therewith. I would like to add that local boards of education are very happy with the provisions of Public Law 874 and the philosophy connected therewith. They were pleased that the Congress provided these funds for the 1951-52 school year. Of course, they are looking forward to the Congress making a deficiency appropriation and thereby keeping faith with the local community for providing educational opportunities for the federally connected children.

I have asked Mr. Needham and Mr. Kamp-schroeder to call at your office for the purpose of discussing this program as it is now operating in Kansas. Please feel free to contact me at any time with reference to Federal legislation that will affect the public schools of this State.

Yours truly,
ADEL F. THROCKMORTON,
State Superintendent of Public In-
struction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

(Mr. MILLER of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. RHODES of Arizona addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDON].

(Mr. CONDON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. It seems clear to me that no matter how much we all desire economy in government, it is false economy to save money at the expense of the proper instruction of our children. Obviously the future of this country belongs to them and the type of instruction and education they receive will have a great effect upon the wisdom with which they maintain and extend the heritage which we will leave them. Certainly, the action of the Appropriations Committee in removing the item of \$24 million of Federal moneys to be paid in those districts with tremendous numbers of federally connected school children is, in my judgment, false economy.

In many areas of the country it will mean the continuance of double and even triple sessions and it will mean the production of a generation of poorly educated young men and women. America cannot afford the consequence of such short-sightedness. Moreover the action of the Appropriations Committee in cutting the deficiency budget by \$24 million in this respect is directly opposed to the request of the President of the United States. Just 16 days ago, in his state-of-the-Union speech, President Eisenhower addressed both houses of Congress and made the following statement:

One phase of the school problem demands special attention. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 20. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

Is this Congress again going to repudiate the President of the United States? Is this Congress so unfeeling and so heedless of our children's future as to take the backward step proposed by the Appropriations Committee?

In my own Sixth District of California, where approximately 25 percent of the wage earners are employed in federally owned projects, the result of this cut upon our schools will be catastrophic. Programs that have been planned cannot be completed. I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a chart showing the entitlements for the various school districts in my congressional district for 1951-52, the approximate amount of the entitlement for 1952-53 if the \$24 million is restored, and the approximate amount of entitlement for 1952-53 if the cut is maintained.

State of California

SOLANO COUNTY

| Project No. | Name of district | 100 percent amount of entitlement for 1951-52 school year | Approximate amount of entitlement, 1952-53 | |
|--------------------|---|---|--|--------------|
| | | | 100 percent | 60 percent |
| Calif-53-E-27..... | Vallejo Unified School District..... | \$889,801.16 | \$972,426.09 | \$583,455.65 |
| Calif-53-E-57..... | Fairfield Elementary School District..... | 18,639.12 | ¹ 21,807.77 | 13,084.66 |
| Calif-53-E-75..... | Benicia Unified School District..... | 101,799.81 | ¹ 119,105.78 | 71,463.47 |
| Calif-53-E-79..... | Crystal Union School District..... | 39,808.08 | ¹ 46,575.45 | 27,945.27 |
| Calif-53-E-90..... | Vaca Valley Union School District..... | 18,270.71 | ¹ 21,376.73 | 12,826.04 |
| Calif-53-E-91..... | Vacaville Union High School District..... | 4,599.56 | ¹ 5,381.49 | 3,228.89 |
| Calif-53-E-96..... | Armijo Union High School District..... | 11,200.21 | ¹ 13,104.25 | 7,862.55 |
| | Total..... | 1,084,118.65 | 1,199,777.56 | 719,866.53 |

¹ The amounts indicated in the 1952-53 column at 100 percent is based on a percentage estimate of the 1952 application.

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

| Project No. | Name of district | 100 percent amount of entitlement for 1951-52 school year | Approximate amount of entitlement, 1952-53 | |
|---------------------|--|---|--|------------|
| | | | 100 percent | 60 percent |
| Calif-53-E-33..... | Pittsburg Unified School District..... | 61,893.95 | 72,415.92 | 43,449.55 |
| Calif-53-E-38..... | Mount Diablo Unified School District..... | 103,281.71 | 120,839.60 | 72,503.76 |
| Calif-53-E-41..... | Richmond City School District..... | 411,615.94 | 481,590.65 | 288,954.39 |
| Calif-53-E-44..... | Richmond Union High School District..... | 69,482.96 | 81,295.06 | 48,777.04 |
| Calif-53-E-55..... | Contra Costa Junior College District. ¹ | | | |
| Calif-53-E-77..... | San Pablo School District..... | 22,411.47 | 26,221.42 | 15,732.85 |
| Calif-53-E-163..... | Rodeo School District..... | 33,991.41 | 39,769.95 | 23,861.97 |
| Calif-53-E-239..... | Lafayette School District..... | 4,700.16 | 5,499.19 | 3,299.51 |
| Calif-53-E-240..... | John Swett Union High School District..... | 8,511.79 | 9,958.78 | 5,975.27 |
| Calif-53-E-330..... | Liberty Union High School District. ² | | | |
| Calif-53-E-331..... | Danville Union School District..... | 1,797.12 | 2,102.63 | 1,261.58 |
| Calif-53-E-332..... | Walnut Creek School District..... | 3,870.72 | 4,528.74 | 2,717.24 |
| Calif-53-E-333..... | San Ramon Valley Union School District. ³ | | | |
| | Total..... | 721,557.23 | 844,221.95 | 506,533.16 |

¹ Deductions greater than computed entitlement.

² Did not meet 3 percent eligibility requirement.

³ Application canceled per applicant's request.

NOTE.—Amounts indicated in the 1952-53 column at 100 percent is based on a percentage estimate of the 1952 application.

It will be noted that 18 school districts will be cut \$817,635.82, if the \$24 million is not restored. Where are we to obtain this money? Every one of the school districts is bonded to the legal limit. The State of California recently made available certain additional sums which the districts have obtained. No further action from the State can be expected. Without this money our school program will be crippled.

Senator TAFT, in a recent public statement, urged continuance of these payments as part of the Republican legislative program. The reasons given by the Appropriations Committee in its report seem to be singularly unconvincing. In this connection, I might point out it has been estimated that the Federal Government owns tax exempt real property which would be appraised for tax purposes at approximately \$20 billion. If the 6-mill tax rate were applied to these properties—6 mills being the approximate average tax for school purposes throughout the country—the Federal Government would be called upon to pay approximately \$120 million for the support of the school districts. Therefore, I think we must not fall below the \$64 million contemplated for this fiscal year and should restore the \$24 million to the \$40 million previously appropriated.

I urge very strongly an "aye" vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

(Mr. HAGEN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas restoring to this appropriation bill the amount of money necessary to carry out the provisions of Public Law 847 for the 1952-53 school year. I do so on behalf of the 10 public schools in my district receiving funds under that law and on behalf of districts having similar problems throughout the United States.

We in California are proud of our tax-supported colleges and secondary and elementary schools and we assume the whole responsibility for providing them and operating them under difficult conditions of growth occasioned by a tremendous increase in school population when no abnormal factors exist.

However, the increase in school population in a limited area attributable to the presence of huge United States military installations is an abnormal factor in those cases where such installations for reasons of strategy and economy are located in areas without any substantial property or population in addition to military personnel and property. This observation is true of the installations in my district. The fact is that without the requisite Federal aid no adequate system

of schools for the children of military and civilian personnel would be provided. No local real and personal property tax base exists which would support such schools.

Previous Congresses recognized this problem and passed Public Law 847 to meet it. It would be a gross and inexcusable breach of faith for this Congress to fail to implement the law. The school district beneficiaries thereof are today educating little children in accordance with proper standards after commitments in the form of teacher contracts and other obligations on the assumption that we will implement it. These actions of these districts are irretrievable and it would be immoral for us to say now by indirection that we had concluded an established policy was erroneous. Ignoring the consideration of the pledge contained in the law I rather doubt that anyone here seriously doubts the wisdom of the program. The President of the United States in his state of the Union message endorsed the program and policy, and I heartily agree with his endorsement.

The assertion has been made that some districts are receiving aid which should not properly be entitled to such aid according to a standard of necessity. I say that if we want to change the bath water let us not throw out the baby along with the dirty water and that is exactly the result of the action of denying a law by failure to appropriate enough money to implement it. The time will come for reexamination of the law itself, either at this session or in 1954 when the law is slated for expiration. I have in my district a naval test station located on the desert. It is the seat of almost all the population and activity in the area and its inhabitants almost the sole beneficiary of schools maintained there to which the State of California makes a substantial contribution. The activities of this station are directed to helping us with better weapons of war and it employs persons of first-rate training and ability who insist on adequate education for their children. A serious problem exists in recruiting qualified people to work in such a remote area. A more serious problem will exist if we are derelict in our duty in supplying adequate education there and in other areas.

It is no fair criticism to say that school districts calculated to be eligible for this program have not already claimed money due them including the money here sought to be appropriated under the formula set up in the statute. School officials cannot accurately predict from year to year the exact facts of future school population and the procedure set up in the law for reimbursement after the fact is a suitable method of handling these allocations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

(Mr. WIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, it was my pleasure in 1950, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, to be one of those who were assigned to sub-

committee work in about seven of the States, involving the districts of many Members of Congress, in connection with this legislation. It was my privilege and pleasure to have on the committee on which I served our present chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL]. I think he, like me, was astounded at the conditions under which too many school districts of this Nation are today trying to give an education to their boys and girls.

In the discussion this afternoon on this bill the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] made known the question that has arisen on the border between Kansas and Missouri. Last year we had that same question arise on the border of Maine. I think those matters are subject to review and correction, where a plant is in one State and the schools to which the children go and the homes of the people that work in the plant are across the line in another State. I think those are questions that can be settled without too much difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, in rising to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], may I say preliminarily that I have been impressed by the way in which a great majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle are able to set at one side partisan and political considerations when considering a matter of grave concern to the Nation. Such a matter is this issue of whether or not we will keep our obligations to our schools, in areas where schools are crowded and heavily burdened by Government projects and defense activities. There are three reasons, it seems to me, which would justify a person on either side of the aisle in supporting the Scrivner amendment, restoring to this appropriation bill money vitally needed to operate our schools. The first is the fact that we have a legal and a moral obligation under the established policy of our Government and of our Congress to make this appropriation. The second is the fact that in our fight against communism we must recognize the fact that education is the very first bulwark of our country in carrying on that fight effectively among the youth of our country. We cannot afford to do anything which will undermine the foundations of that bulwark. The final reason is that this is clearly identified as a bipartisan policy initiated by a Democratic Congress under Democratic leadership. It has also attracted strong Republican leadership, and today we find the President of our country, a Republican, on record in favor of this policy. This is a measure surely on which Democrats and Republicans alike can unite in good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

(Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Scrivner amendment should be adopted in order to fulfill a just obligation of

the Federal Government. We ought to live up to this law, we ourselves approved and helped to enact. The school districts involved in this controversy have not only had a portion of their lands removed from the tax rolls but in addition a large number of federally connected children have been dumped in their laps. These students seek edification and are entitled to receive it.

If these funds are not restored as sought by this amendment many schools would close their doors after a term of from 6½ to 7 months in the current year. At least seven school districts in Arkansas would have to close their doors before the end of the term.

Let us consider for a moment the Gosnell school district in Mississippi County, Ark. Thirty-two percent of the total land area of the district was taken over by the Government and removed from local taxation. Additional lands of the district will be required and obtained during 1953, which would decrease further the funds that would be available to operate the Gosnell school. This school district has voted a millage of 28 mills for maintenance and operation alone and an additional mileage for debt retirement. The district is carrying a heavy load and should receive Federal assistance in order to provide a 9-month term for the district's school children.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on his fine statesmanlike stand.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his statement. I too favor the Scrivner amendment.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is inconceivable to me that the Congress will refuse to appropriate the comparatively small sum of money necessary to keep faith with the schools suffering a Federal impact and who have relied upon the promise of the Federal Government to assume a portion of the expense of operating the schools caused by the Federal impact in the various school districts.

It is claimed by some of those opposing the Scrivner and Fogarty amendments that certain schools are benefiting from the moneys heretofore provided under this Federal aid program and they urge that therefore the deficiency appropriation asked for by the Department of Education ought not to be voted. It may be that some school districts in America are profiting undeservedly by this program, but if so it is the fault of the formula provided in Public Law 874. The President has asked that the policy and program provided for by Public Law 874 be

extended or reenacted. If there are faults in the law, the proper time to correct them is when a bill providing for the continuation of the program is before the House. Certainly the mere fact that a very few schools are profiting undeservedly through some error in the formula adopted when Public Law 874 was passed, cannot justify the Congress in refusing to keep faith with those schools who have entered into contracts with teachers and for other services depending upon the assurances given them by the Congress when it voted overwhelmingly for this program of Federal aid to federally impacted school districts. The honor and integrity of the Congress of the United States is at stake as well as the welfare of the school children living in these areas.

Not only did the President ask for the continuation of this program but he went so far as to ask that this deficiency appropriation be made. All this he did in his state of the Union message.

I agree with those who insist that Federal expenditures be cut to the very minimum consistent with the efficient operation of our Government and consistent with national security. But I am unwilling to slash the budget at the expense of the schoolchildren of America.

As an illustration of the impact of the Korean war on the schools in Georgia, I want to give you the facts with reference to the situation in Cobb County, Ga., where there is located the Lockheed aircraft plant.

Cobb County, Ga., is located 10 miles northeast of and contiguous to the city of Atlanta. The Cobb County school system includes all schools in the county except the independent system of the city of Marietta. The Cobb County school system is one single administrative unit.

I. FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS AFFECTING THE COBB COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

A. The major war industry affecting the Cobb County school system was the Bell Aircraft Corp., erected by the United States Government in 1943 at the cost of \$75,000,000. The peak employment of this industry was 28,000 people.

B. Dobbins Air Base was used extensively for reserve training during the war. There has been much expansion of this air base since 1946; civilian employment, 400; military employment, 600.

C. In March 1946 the Fifth Division of the Veterans' Administration moved into the office space of the old Bell Aircraft Corp. The peak employment was over 2,000 civilians plus police personnel and service people.

The Fifth Division of the Veterans' Administration was removed to Atlanta, Ga., during the period from March 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951. A very large percentage of these employees continued to live in Cobb County and work with the Veterans' Administration in Atlanta.

D. The Allied Packaging Co., in 1946, contracted with the United States Government to recondition tools and equipment at Bell Aircraft Corp. In September 1949, the Tumpene Co. supplanted the Allied Packaging Co. and has an employment of 500 people.

E. In 1947, the United States Government authorized the construction of the Allatoona Dam, the backwaters of which cover more than 3,600 acres of land in Cobb County. During the construction of the Allatoona Dam, a subimpounded dam was being erected at Acworth. These two projects were carried on over a period of more than 2 years.

F. With the impending threat of a world war and with the demand for additional planes in Korea the United States Congress ordered the reactivation of the Bell aircraft plant. In January 1951 Lockheed Aircraft Corp. of California took over this enormous aircraft plant. At the present time the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. has an employment of 12,000 people and are scheduled to reach an employment of 27,000 by January 1954.

G. Many industrial establishments located in Cobb County were called on to contribute to the war effort such as Glover Machine Works, Clark Thread Co., Scripto, Inc., Murray Gin, and Conley Depot.

II. POPULATION GROWTH

Excluding the city of Marietta, the Cobb County census in 1940 was 29,000. The present estimate by the Cobb County Chamber of Commerce is 47,000. This shows an increase of approximately 65 percent.

I give below, a table which represents the affect of the population impact on the Cobb County school system:

| Total average daily attendance | |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| 1938-39 | 5,519 |
| 1942-43 | 5,178 |
| 1951-52 | 9,200 |
| 1952-53 (estimate) | 10,500 |

This reveals a growth of more than 100 percent of students in the Cobb County school system since 1942-43, the year the bomber plant was started. It has been determined by educational agencies that approximately 3,800 of these children were directly connected with Federal installations in Cobb County.

III. HOUSING

According to statistics provided by county officials there have been more than 3,000 houses constructed outside of Marietta during the last 18 months. In January 1952 Mr. Thigpen of the FHA, authorized the construction of 750 defense housing units outside the city limits of Marietta.

IV. FINANCES

It is the combined judgment of the Cobb County Board of Education and of the Superintendent that the United States Government, due to the installation of Federal industrial plants in Cobb County, is responsible for a sudden impact in school attendance and has placed upon the applicant, a substantial and continuing financial burden if they provide a fair and reasonable educational opportunity for the children under its jurisdiction.

(a) The millage levied in 1942-43 was 5 mills. Since 1946, 15 mills have been levied by the Cobb County Board of Education, an increase of 300 percent.

(b) Tax assessments according to the tax collector, Mr. James E. Berry, have increased from 1938-39 by 60 percent.

(c) In November 1950, the citizens of Cobb County voted a bond issue of \$1½ million for school construction. The Cobb County Board of Education has exhausted its local strength to provide housing for its children. It is carefully estimated that within the next 12 months, the Cobb County school system will need an additional \$700,000 to adequately house its children. For the past 8 years, one-third of 3,500 children have been housed in classrooms of the Army camp barrack type construction which were poorly heated, inadequately lighted, and very little ventilation. The people and residents of Cobb County are becoming very resentful of the heavy burden of taxation on them when the Federal Government is not meeting its responsibility.

(d) The Cobb County school system has been notified by the United States Office of Education that the Cobb County Board of Education has a building entitlement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. In many parts of our country the Federal Government has condemned and acquired large blocks of real estate and buildings and thereby has taken these properties off the tax rolls of the local communities.

The local governments—city, county, State, and the school districts—have lost the tax revenues which these local governmental units derived heretofore from these lands and buildings. This, in some cases, has impoverished the local governments.

Yet, despite this loss of tax revenue, the local governments still must render service to those who live on these Federal holdings. The local government must supply these people who live on Federal lands with police and fire protection and educate their children. It is only fair that the Federal Government, which took these properties off a school district's tax rolls, should pay something in lieu of taxes for the education of the children of those who live on this tax free property.

In Vancouver, Wash., for example, the Federal Government owns a large housing project. There are about 2,300 occupied homes in this housing project. These families are sending more than 4,000 children to the Vancouver schools.

The Federal Government, in such a case as this, should make, in all fairness, to the city of Vancouver some payment in lieu of taxes to provide for the cost of educating the children who come from these tax-free lands.

Early last year the Congress did make appropriations of about \$120,000 to the Vancouver school district and promised at the time to pay another \$40,000 to \$50,000 to the Vancouver district sometime prior to July 1 of this year.

This amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] merely provides funds for schools in cities like Vancouver another \$45,000

prior to July 1 and should, in my opinion, be adopted.

I am for economy. I want to see spending cut. However, I do not want to see the first cuts made at the expense of the school children.

The Federal Government today owns and controls 455 million acres of land in the 48 States. Many millions of acres of this land never should have been in Federal ownership. The thing for the Federal Government to do, in the interest of economy, is to sell some of the unneeded lands it now holds and get them back into private hands and thereby onto the tax rolls of the local communities.

If this were done we would not have local school districts asking for aid in lieu of tax payments.

The road to economy is not in cutting down funds needed for the maintenance of reasonable standards of education in our schools, but to get some of the 455 million acres of Federal Government-owned lands into private hands and back onto the tax rolls, when taxes from these lands will help support local government and local schools.

The Federal Government today owns 23.9 percent of all the landed area of the 48 States. This is an area ten times the size of the combined area of the 10 New England States. No reasonable person believes that it is either necessary or desirable that that much land should be in Federal Government ownership.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is justified and must be restored. Anyway in the world you examine it, it seems to me one must vote to keep the funds in the bill, be it by the Scrivner amendment or the Fogarty amendment. It would be wrong to do otherwise. The need exists. The funds are required. The law says on the one hand to parents, "You must send your child to school." On the other hand the government, by law in the various communities, is prevented from obligating funds they do not have. What are they to do? Get out of education? How far out? To keep the kids at home, raise them in ignorance and fear, ripe for child labor?

We are growing at the rate of 2 million people a year. By 1975 we will be a Nation of over 200 million people. I want to keep this land of ours, by virtue of its educational system, the envy and despair of every other nation in the world.

I intend to vote for the Scrivner amendment, as it will be altered by the Fogarty amendment—the \$20½ million cut must be restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the question involved here is not the education of children. The question involved is whether or not the Congress will at this time abandon its function of reviewing and passing on appropriations to Federal bureaucrats.

There were no justifications presented by this Bureau to our committee for this deficiency appropriation. For 150 years

it has been customary for the Committee on Appropriations to go over the requests of agencies, even the military, and to review them most exactly, and unless they make a case, refuse the funds. In this case only the wildest kind of speculation upon the part of this Department could justify a deficiency.

This same Department has come here with a record, which I have here, of having made two separate statements as to the condition of their funds, on the same date and at the same time. On one which they brought to the Committee on Appropriations last Tuesday they said they had spent last year \$47,072,000. In the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL], as I understand it, yesterday they said that last year they spent \$48½ million. At which time are you going to believe them?

On the other item they told us in a statement they brought up on the 17th that they had obligated \$5,715,983. In the statement that they made in their justification which was submitted about the 15th of January, they said they had obligated on that date \$5,092,000. Frankly, I cannot go along with that kind of business, and I cannot have anything to do with supporting such a thing.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in support of the amendment to restore to schools in war-impacted areas the funds which were cut from the supplemental appropriation bill, I think it is particularly important to note that the swollen populations which make this Federal assistance imperative did not result from any activity or desire of the small, independent school districts involved. It was the result of the sudden development of Federal establishments necessary to the defense effort and which placed an unexpected and intolerable burden upon the taxpayers of the affected localities. This dislocation of their educational programs could not have been anticipated or provided for.

The responsibility of the Federal Government to bear its proper share of the cost of alleviating this hardship is acknowledged by Federal contributions in the past and by implied commitments for the present and immediate future. This obligation was recognized by the President of the United States in his message to Congress when he stated as follows:

One phase of the school problem demands special attention. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 20. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

Please note that his last sentence deals specifically with the critical problem we now discuss.

Based on Federal representations, school budgets were built in dependence on the Federal contribution, additional teachers were hired to handle overcrowded classrooms and building programs were initiated to provide the ex-

panded facilities required for the unexpected population growth.

Failure to receive the supplemental funds would cripple scholastic programs in many small, independent school districts. It would mean, in substance, a 40-percent cut in anticipated revenue, with this tremendous loss to be absorbed in the last quarter of the current school year. This would be disastrous to many districts.

The Washington Star, long recognized as a staunch foe of unnecessary spending, made this forceful editorial statement on the question of these school funds:

Recognizing the impracticability as well as the injustice of saddling these uninvited burdens on the communities concerned, Congress very properly adopted the policy of extending certain Federal aid to them. The school-aid program is a part of this program. This aid could not be discontinued in any area where the expansion still continues without doing an injustice to all who live there and without doing harm to the interests of the Government itself.

We should ponder well the implications of that last sentence. Not to restore these funds would do harm to the interests of the Government itself.

Passage of this amendment will do even more than to save the vital school programs of overburdened communities; it will provide renewed assurance of the good faith of the Federal Government in living up to its proper obligations.

In my particular district, comprising 11 counties in Texas, only 2 counties are affected. But the failure of this amendment would be well-nigh tragic to 7 school districts in 1 county and to 1 school district in the other.

The figures involved would not be impressive, recited on this floor. When I point out that the Federal funds for the Bancroft Common School District in Orange County will be cut from \$6,376.12 to \$3,825.67 if this amendment fails, the sum might seem so trivial as to be unworthy of mention.

Unworthy of mention—unless we stop to consider that the Bancroft Common School District is made up of people—good American folks who want only the right to have their children receive the same schooling that is provided in communities where a sudden influx of defense projects has not dislocated the tax economy.

We in the 83d Congress all hope, I am sure, to cut every unnecessary penny out of every appropriation bill that comes before us—but it is not now time—and may the time never come—when it is necessary to effect our economies at the sacrifice of our children's education.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the provision of funds for aid to critical and impacted school areas is a matter of vital importance and necessity, and I support the Fogarty amendment to restore funds in the amount of \$20,500,000 for this purpose.

I know personally of the great need which has been alleviated through prior operation of this program administered through the Office of Education.

The decision of the Department of Defense to locate the Arnold Engineering Development Center in Coffee County, Tenn., near Tullahoma, re-

sulted in a situation very critical to the schools of that area and it has been only through the assistance program of aid to impacted school districts that a very serious condition has to a great degree been relieved. In Coffee and Franklin Counties, where this project is situated, it has been necessary to extend this aid program to the Manchester Tennessee Board of Education in two instances—this for additions to existing school plants. In Tullahoma, also in Coffee County, the city board of education has found it necessary to enlist Federal aid for the construction of a new elementary school building—so great has been the influx of new children and the increase in the school population due to the AEDC.

Also in Franklin County, in the vicinity of the project, school officials have found it necessary to request aid for additions to four different elementary schools in the district which I am honored to represent.

Also in the Fourth Tennessee District there is still another military installation which has caused great hardship from the influx of additional school pupils. I am referring to the expansion of Stewart Air Force Base at Smyrna, in Rutherford County. Expansion of this base has necessitated Rutherford County officials seeking aid for construction of an additional elementary school to house the increased school population at Smyrna and also for additions to existing plants in Smyrna.

Without this program, these areas would have experienced great hardship and restrictions on their educational programs through no fault of their own.

I cannot urge too strongly that the great program be continued until it is safely considered that the trouble spots have been eliminated and the schools of the Nation are relieved of the great burden of sudden floods of school children due to suddenly increased population in defense areas.

I urge restoration of these funds.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, the action of the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives would deprive a number of communities in the First Congressional District of substantial sums of money which the Government of the United States has previously obligated itself to pay for operational and construction costs in education.

All of these communities have relied on the promise of the Government to make these funds available; to suddenly break this promise appears to me to be offensive from a moral as well as a legal standpoint.

President Eisenhower in the state of the Union address little more than 2 weeks ago recognized this problem when he said:

One phase of the school problem demands special attention. The school population of many districts has been greatly increased by the swift growth of defense activities. These activities have added little or nothing to the tax resources of the communities affected. Legislation aiding construction of schools in these districts expires on June 20. This law should be renewed; and, likewise, the partial payments for current operating expenses for these particular school districts

should be made, including the deficiency requirement of the current fiscal year.

And yet his words apparently go unheeded on this vital issue of education. At a time when so much of our budget goes for military defense purposes we begrudge, it seems, this comparatively modest financial support to our first line of defense: education.

It appears to me that there are better places for the cut of expenses than in this area of education.

I am fully in favor of restoring the appropriation of \$24 million for Federal aid to education. I shall support every measure to achieve this objective.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, many reasons have been given for the support of the Scrivner amendment which provides for an appropriation of \$24 million to assist local governments in federally impacted areas to provide for the education of the children in those areas, who through the action of the Federal Government have been thrust upon the people in those areas. One of the points that I do not believe has been made quite clear is that should we not provide these funds, it would then become necessary for the Department of Defense to come to us and ask for funds in order to provide educational facilities for the children who are presently living on Federal bases. It is my firm conviction that the establishment of these schools located on Federal installations to provide for the education of the children living thereon would be much more costly than the sum now asked and provided for in the pending amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I support the Fogarty amendment. There would be chaos if the rules were changed in the middle of the year. That would be the case if no provision were made for continued Federal financial assistance during the remainder of the school year.

Programs were arranged in anticipation of Federal participation and there has been no warning that it might suddenly be cut off. In many cases such action would be fatal to continued operation. Six different school districts in Alaska, plus some schools under direct control of the Commissioner of Education, would be affected. The total loss in anticipated revenues from the Federal Government would be \$165,334.25. It would be difficult and in some instances impossible in Alaska to meet an emergency that could not have been foreseen. Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed unfortunate that the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has disallowed the entire request of \$24 million, which would provide funds for the operation and maintenance of schools located in federally affected areas as provided in Public Law 847.

It is estimated that over 2,000 schools receive assistance under this appropriation. In areas where there is a great deal of abnormal employment—most of which has been concentrated in the communities in recent years by reason of defense production—there are thousands of children requiring education which

the local government units cannot take care of.

I am very much in favor of all legislation which will economize and reduce the cost of government, but I do not think it is economy to eliminate this appropriation, which will provide an education for thousands of American school children.

The country realizes that we are under an abnormal economic situation when our Government is spending billions toward defense production. During the last 10 years, hundreds of thousands of families have moved into areas where they can get employment at new defense installations pertaining to the Army, Navy, Air Force, Atomic Energy, and so forth. It is the duty of the Federal Government to aid these local communities in handling school facilities for the great number of children that are brought into the community by reason of these Federal defense installations.

I represent a great industrial area in the Calumet region in Indiana and during the last 10 years our population has increased tremendously because of defense production. Our schools, kindergarten, grade and high schools, are overcrowded to such an extent that a number of local communities cannot meet the situation to provide adequate education for this added load of pupils and students.

I am going to vote for the amendment offered by Congressman FOGARTY to reinstate this appropriation, which will aid these communities to educate the children of defense workers. By appropriating this money, I firmly believe in the long run it is an economy measure because if thousands of American children are denied a proper education it would only be a few years until our Government would realize its mistake.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the appropriation of funds for schools in our impacted defense areas, and it is my hope and prayer that this may be provided for in the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1953.

The matter of education for our children is of utmost importance to each of us, and I believe we all agree that the problem of adequate educational facilities in these defense areas is a serious one. I have such an area in my own district. The Mathieson Chemical Corp. at Morgantown, W. Va., is now employing over 1,000 defense workers in the Morgantown ordnance works, owned by the Department of the Army. There is a marked increase in the population in the Monongalia County area and, naturally, the enrollment in the schools has been increased. The schools are greatly overcrowded and there are not sufficient facilities to accommodate the students. In some instances it has been necessary to transport children from their home communities to school buildings where facilities had to be improvised.

It is my feeling that we are obligated to grant this allocation for the expansion of the school facilities in the defense areas. President Truman signed the measure during the 82d Congress which provided for maintenance and operation

of school facilities in these areas, and this was also stipulated by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message a few weeks ago.

Yes, I believe this is an obligation which this Congress must assume, and I am in favor of it for all such defense areas in the whole United States.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, just as many other school districts around the Nation have been affected by Federal activities in their area, nine school districts in Montana are affected. If this amendment is not adopted, these Montana school districts will lose more than \$100,000.

Districts which stand to lose and the amounts involved include:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| District No. 6, Columbia Falls----- | \$36, 627 |
| District No. 1, Glasgow----- | 6, 754 |
| District No. 1, Great Falls----- | 33, 329 |
| District No. 21, Fort Peck----- | 12, 942 |
| District No. 13, Nashua----- | 1, 883 |
| District No. 7, Gardiner----- | 4, 372 |
| District No. 3, Hamilton----- | 2, 318 |
| District No. 33, Helena----- | 3, 104 |
| District No. 50, Evergreen-Kalispell-- | 1, 127 |

It is gratifying that some of the gentlemen who have participated in this discussion are becoming aware of the effect of Federal ownership in their districts. We in the West have had such a condition confronting us for many years.

Two-fifths of Montana is nontax-paying public land. In some districts the Federal Government owns over 90 percent of the land and this is not something new. For years Montana has had Federal forest lands and Indian reservations, the former cutting into the amount of land on the tax rolls, the latter placing an added burden on school facilities. Unlike Federal projects in some States, these forest lands and Indian reservations do not bring in additional homes, payrolls, and incomes to broaden the tax base.

But I disagree with some of my colleagues that the answer to this is to discontinue these needed activities. We, in Montana, do not want to eliminate the Forest Service. We would not allow Glacier National Park to pass from control by the Federal Government for all the people.

The real solution is as proposed in the Fogarty amendment, to make adequate payment, in lieu of taxes, for loss to the school districts by tax-free activities of the Federal Government. This money which the Congress promised last year already has been budgeted by these school districts in the State of Montana. These districts are taxed to their constitutional limits and have been aided by the State to statutory limits and they still must have this assistance to remain open for the balance of the school year.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I am basically committed to, and support, reduction in Government expenditures and balancing the budget. However, in connection with the debate on taking out of the second supplemental appropriation bill the item for Federal aid to schools, I voted for the Scrivner amendment to restore \$20,500,000 for this purpose. My vote is based on conditions which pertain to southern Maryland, where we have some of the most highly

impacted and critical areas. The Federal Government has taken thousands of acres of our ground, causing a heavy loss in tax revenue. At the same time we are confronted with a continuing heavy influx of population coincidental with the expansion of Federal projects and installations in this area. This increase in population adds to the overburdening of our already crowded school system.

While I am for economy, I think it would be wrong to start with our schools and our school children. For these reasons I have voted to restore this item for aid to schools.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to express to the far-sighted Members of the House my deepest appreciation for their help in getting the \$20.4 million put back in the appropriation bill.

While these funds to aid schools in the federally impacted areas are not pork barrel or handout funds, it seems that very often it is necessary to stage a floor fight to get them restored after they have been left out by the committee. This should not be necessary.

These funds for maintenance and operation and construction of school facilities should be provided automatically on a permanent basis, because it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to the communities affected and to the people of these communities.

This responsibility should be accepted by the Federal Government and discharged by providing the necessary funds for this purpose. I am hopeful that the committee will not again indulge in this form of false economy, but in making retrenchments will do so where justified, in the interests of the taxpayers.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the debate on this bill. Also, I am aware of the need for some money for the operation of school districts that have been shouldered with responsibilities which they cannot bear. These responsibilities have come from the impact of service personnel who have come in large numbers to new or to expanded military posts of the Army, Air Force, and the Navy.

We should provide these districts with money so they may give education to the children of our service personnel. In several cases that I have in mind in my present congressional district—eleventh of California—and in my former congressional district—third of California—the school district did not have the taxing power or the bonding capacity to raise the money necessary to expand its facilities to take care of the new students who wished to attend the schools. Neither, has the State of California the money to pay for all the situations created in our State by the rapid influx of service personnel and the expansion of them. To understand the problem one must have studied and examined it, as I have in the area around Stockton, Fairfield, North Sacramento, Benecia, Vacaville, and Vallejo, Calif.

To me the Scrivner amendment is a sensible effort to take care of the educational requirements caused by the influx of service personnel into areas where the schools are already crowded. If the

Scrivner amendment is not passed I favor the Fogarty amendment, which gives the schools several millions less. Either amendment will help relieve a distressing situation and be helpful to the children who may be the victims of a bad situation. My vote will go for the Scrivner amendment and if it is not passed then for the Fogarty amendment.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Chairman, during the war period and since, it would have been impossible for the Mobile schools to operate without the help received from the Federal Government through the Lanham Act funds and Public Laws 815 and 874. Before the war, the enrollment in Mobile County Public Schools was 24,000, whereas now the enrollment is 43,000. A recent survey of school population seems to suggest that their school enrollment will be approximately 53,000 by September 1, 1955. This will necessitate the construction of more than 300 additional classrooms in addition to all the building projects now under way, made possible in most instances by Federal funds. During the past year the Mobile school system has received approximately \$3 million for school building purposes from Federal sources. They need, in addition, by 1955 a minimum of \$4 million to complete the needed construction, if double sessions are to be averted. Local funds for capital outlay purposes are very limited. They have recently borrowed \$1¼ million for capital outlay purposes based on the extension of their three mill county and three mill district taxes. Their total borrowing capacity for such purposes is exhausted except for a million and a quarter dollars. This means that at least \$2¾ million between now and 1955 will have to come from other sources. All of the above facts indicate that it is absolutely impossible for Mobile schools to meet their growing needs without a continuation of Federal aid. Most of the increase in school population in Mobile County has been brought about by the impact of the Federal Government's activities and projects within the county. Without the \$3 million already received, it would be necessary for a large number of the schools in Mobile County to operate next year on double sessions. They have never been able to eliminate double sessions completely since the beginning of World War II.

I urge the passage of the amendment.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, we all want to reduce expenditures but in doing so surely we do not want to repudiate obligations incurred by us pursuant to laws which we ourselves enacted. Surely we do not want to deprive American children of educational opportunities to which they are legally entitled by virtue of Federal law. If this Congress did not intend to appropriate the necessary funds to carry out the program of aid to federally impacted school districts it should not have authorized the program in the first place. But we did authorize the program. We did promise help to schools impacted by Federal activities. Now to make a political economy gesture we are threatening to deprive many children of proper education. The appropriation before us will not affect the total

of Federal expenditure very much. It will, however, have a definite effect on families and faculties throughout the length and breadth of this great land. Mr. Chairman, we are as obligated to make this appropriation as we are to appropriate funds to pay interest on Government bonds. We have a legal obligation to make these payments—and a moral one as well. I hope this appropriation will be made and the honor of this Congress upheld. We must keep faith with the children whose schools are depending upon us for assistance which we promised to give them.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and wish to point out a serious situation which exists in my own district. Unfortunately Public Laws 815 and 874 are not broad enough to take care of the situation to which I shall refer.

Perhaps every Member of this House is generally familiar with the great Fort Bragg military establishment located in North Carolina. Since 1918 the Federal Government has appropriated for this military installation approximately \$390 million. In 1918 the Federal Government initiated this camp. It was at that time that the financial problems of Hoke County, in my district, began. It was in 1918 that the Federal Government moved into Hoke County and took 102,000 acres of fertile Hoke County soil land for the establishment of Fort Bragg. This represented approximately one-third of the land area of the county at that time.

Since 1918 the Federal Government has held title to these 102,000 acres in Hoke County, N. C., and the county unit of government has lost approximately \$435,000 in public revenues as a result of this Federal holding. The public school needs of the county have increased generally in proportion as they have in other sections of North Carolina and the country. Unfortunately only a very few of the Army personnel live in Hoke County and for that reason we are told Hoke County has been unable to fully qualify. I contend, however, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps there is a more serious military impact on Hoke County than any of the other situations that may exist in the country.

Hoke County now has a heavy bonded school indebtedness. This bonded indebtedness amounts to \$293,000. In addition, the county is supplementing in the amount of \$82,000 State funds for its county school system. While these figures may not be large as compared to other areas in the country, I insist that it is a very heavy load on a county that has a civilian population of only 15,000 people and an annual budget of \$250,000 for its normal operations.

It was not until March 1952 that Hoke County was able to receive any consideration from the Federal Government to help carry along the educational load in this impacted military area. The amount granted during 1952 was only \$1,630, a most insignificant sum when one stops to consider the fact that the county lost approximately one-third of its taxable land area to the Federal Gov-

ernment for the establishment of Fort Bragg.

What I have previously stated, of course, is serious. I now point up what I consider to be the most serious dilemma ever to face a county unit of government in North Carolina. The Defense Establishment now proposes to move into Hoke County again under Public Laws 155 and 534 of the 82d Congress and acquire 46,000 acres of land under a military expansion program.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have supported our military program. I do feel, however, that in this instance the Defense Establishment must take into consideration the fact that if they move in and by condemnation insist on taking 46,000 additional acres of land, over one-half of the remaining land area of Hoke County will be under the control of the Federal Government, a unit of government will be destroyed. This 46,000 additional acres of land that the Defense Establishment proposes to take over represents some of the richest and most productive farming land in our State.

With all of the force at my command I insist that the very existence of the county is threatened if the Federal Government insists on taking this land and without giving something in return.

I insist that this is not a problem that should be borne by the State of North Carolina.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that if the proposed program of the military is carried out it will represent the most serious military impacts upon a unit of government to be found in the country.

It is the feeling of the citizens of Hoke County, those people close to the situation that other and suitable land area is available. I shall continue to insist that the rights of the citizens of Hoke County be protected.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I will cast my vote with what I expect to be the overwhelming majority of the House in supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. But I do want to call to the attention of the House what the defense establishment is thinking about concerning a county in my own district. The proper committees of this Congress must take note of this and other areas where the military is moving in and creating most serious situations.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, California has historically provided a high standard in all its public schools. We have been one of the leaders in this Nation in providing a truly American standard of education for all of our young men and women from the kindergarten through the junior-college grades—a free education in every sense of the word.

During the past 6 years the voters of California have increased almost 100 percent the amount of funds which the State contributes to the support of the public schools of California. At the present time we provide approximately \$200 in State funds for every student in average daily attendance in the elementary grades. We provided approximately \$250 for every student in average daily at-

tendance in the junior colleges and high schools of our State.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, voters in my State have approved in the past 5 years bond issues totaling \$430 million for construction of school buildings in impacted areas. This assistance from the State is outside the regular and usual procedures for the local bonding of school districts to meet construction needs.

The report of the subcommittee on page 17 states:

Testimony and reports received by the committee leave no doubt that there are a very great many cases where these funds go to school districts where it is obvious that local income could care for the situation.

That is not the case, Mr. Chairman, in California.

Our school districts are permitted by law to levy a maximum tax rate for local contribution to the operation of the schools a rate of 90 cents per \$100 value at the elementary level, 75 cents for high schools, 35 cents for junior colleges, a total rate in the unified districts of \$2 per \$100 for school support. Practically every district in California today levies that maximum rate of tax and many, many of the districts, by special vote of the people, are now levying taxes in excess of the maximums permissible by law.

We have over 2 million youngsters attending our schools. Of this total of 2 million, 500,638 are in attendance at schools having pupils affected by the provision of Public Law 874.

If we withhold this money from the States we in California are going to be forced to accept a lessening of the quality of education given our youngsters, because our schools are operating under a budget predicated upon a Federal contribution to help underwrite the loss of, or absence of, local tax base because of defense installations. From 15,000 to 20,000 children in attendance at schools on military bases are going to be denied an educational program. It is quite possible that additional thousands in attendance at schools deriving anywhere from 2 to 46 percent of their budget under the provision of Public Law 874 will also be denied an educational opportunity, because the loss of funds will result in early termination of the semester. If funds available do not permit 170 days of school, those districts under the provision of the California school law will be denied State contribution, because only those districts having 170 days of school receive their State apportionment.

I am supporting the amendment because there is no way under the California law, and I am certain under our State constitution, for the school district to go back and raise at the local level the funds they had planned on receiving from the Federal Government.

It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the districts in making their budget had solid reasons for assuming that the Federal Government would go through with commitments which were certainly implied. I realize fully the desire on the part of every Member of the Congress to bring about economies in the Federal

Government, but economies at the expense of the young men and women of America are not the ones I subscribe to.

I urge this House to adopt this amendment, to acknowledge a responsibility on the part of the Federal Government to assist in those areas of the Nation which are overly burdened as a result of the defense activities now undertaken by the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY to the amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Strike out "\$24 million" and insert "\$20,500,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 197, noes 18.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUSBEY) there were—ayes 199, noes 37.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On page 7, after line 7, after "Social Security Agency", insert under the caption of Office of Education: "to further implement Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress to provide funds for supervision of construction, \$145,000."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope it will not require much time for me to convince the Members of the House that here is a matter that must be adjusted. A companion law to Public Law 874 was Public Law 815, which provided construction money for the construction of school facilities in the several impacted school districts.

During the fiscal year 1950 the Budget Bureau and the Appropriations Committee saw fit to provide \$135 million of construction money and in providing that amount of money they authorized \$750,000 out of the \$135 million to be used as supervisory funds to be transferred by the Office of Education to General Services to pay for the supervising of the construction of these school facilities.

The Congress came along in July, a day or two before the 82d Congress recessed, and added \$80 million. The Senate cut the amount down to \$60 million of additional construction money, but made no provision for the transfer of any funds from the Office of Education to General Services to cover the cost of supervising the construction of these school facilities.

This amendment is a simple provision whereby the Office of Education can transfer funds already in its hands. It is not going to cost the taxpayers any

additional money. We just want them to have authority to transfer from funds provided under Public Law 815 for construction purposes \$145,000 which will be transferred to General Services to cover the cost of the inspectors who inspect these approximately 700 or more school facilities now under construction.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me a statement as to the number of projects under construction at the present time and I want to give you an idea of what we will be up against by the end of the year on this proposition. As of the present time there are 675 projects under construction. By the end of the second quarter of this present fiscal year there will be 1,234 projects under construction, by the end of the third quarter, 1,258, and by the end of the fiscal year, 1,263 projects under construction.

May I say that the Committee on Education and Labor did not want the Office of Education to go into the business of setting up a costly inspection service and the hiring of engineers at a tremendous rate of salary to do this work, so we provided in Public Law 815—and I would like to quote from it on page 9, section 209—that—

In carrying out his functions under this title, the Commissioner of Education may utilize the facilities and services of any Federal department or agency and may delegate the performance of any of his functions to any officer or employee of any Federal department or agency.

All this will enable them to transfer the money from the Office of Education to the General Services to recompense them for services rendered. I sincerely hope, without any debate or any further discussion of this matter, that the House will see fit to make these funds available.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Will the gentleman tell me how many projects are under construction in the State of Connecticut?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not have it broken down for the States; I just have it for the Nation.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to page 296 of the hearings and also page 15 of the committee report. The Housing and Home Finance Agency came before the committee and not only asked for \$144,000 as a supplemental amount for fiscal year 1953, but they also asked for over \$1 million for 1954 and 1955.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Briefly.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Office of Education had no business to ask for any funds running beyond the 30th day of June because Public Law 815, unless it is reenacted by this Congress, will be dead the 30th day of June, and that \$145,000 is all they need. They have no business to project it into a future date.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for concurring that much with the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BUSBEY. On page 296, you will see a table which contains a breakdown of the staff for which they want these funds.

They have already received \$750,000, and we think that is sufficient. In the table you will see, item by item, how they would spend \$894,000 if we would give them an additional \$144,000.

Division of law, 1.7 man-years.

Division of community facilities and special operations, 10.7 man-years.

Division of field coordination, 1.5 man-years.

Division of administration, budget and organization, 2.6 man-years.

Finance and accounts, 5.9 man-years.

Personnel, 2.4 man-years.

General Services, 6.1 man-years.

Audit, 1.2 man-years.

There is additional administrative overhead I will not bother reading. A little further in the table, you will find that the man-years requested for engineering, which is the real heart of this work, total only 64.1, which compares with a total of 65.9 for all these other side activities.

There must be a little economy in this budget. We cannot afford the luxury of a big overhead of experts in personnel, budget, finance, organization, and so forth, in a program of this kind.

Engineering is the chief function of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in assisting the Office of Education on the school-construction program. There has been enough money already appropriated to carry out that function.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman that I am heartily in agreement with the committee in that they have no business to project anything into their request for appropriations beyond the \$145,000 because that is needed to complete this year. The legislation may be dead on June 30 if we do not reenact it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Can the gentleman give us any assurance that the legislation will die on June 30?

Mr. BAILEY. I cannot, because I cannot speak for the entire Education Committee, but it was the intention to let it die on June 30, if you do not keep on building atomic-energy installations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is there anything to show anywhere that they need this money to carry on this program the rest of this year?

Mr. BUSBEY. Nothing at all. There is no justification for it at all.

Before closing my remarks, I will read the last sentence of page 15 of our report:

None of the reduction made in this item is to be applied to reduce the engineering personnel or the funds for the travel of such personnel budgeted for this activity.

So there is ample provision for the engineering work needed to do the job.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in view of the vote on the previous amendment, my purpose is now to again pledge allegiance to the Republican President and his administration and support to all the legislation which he or his advisers may send down, whenever I think it is good legislation.

It was a touching tribute the minority paid to the President a few days ago. Our Democratic colleagues, ever delightful and helpful, if I understood them correctly when we had H. R. 1979 before us, stated that they were going along with the grant of legislative power to the President:

We will balance the budget, we will have economy. We will have a balanced budget.

When H. R. 1979 was voted upon there were only 5 in the House, 16 in the Senate, that disagreed with the idea, that if President Roosevelt and President Truman had something, President Ike ought to have it. I suppose that if those two Presidents had had the smallpox, it would still be argued that President Ike ought to have it, because they could not do anything less for him than what they did for the other two Presidents.

Our Democratic colleagues and more especially the New Deal socialistic commentators are having a lot of pleasure over the fact that some of the newspaper boys say we are in disagreement on this side of the aisle. Oh, yes, we have all agreed we must reduce taxes and balance the budget. But which shall we do first? Balance the budget? That is the administration standpoint if I correctly hear the story, if I get it correctly from the newspapers. That is what the President proposes we should do.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just one thing else, and have a greater national defense with less money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, we will get that in spite of the road blocks that may be thrown in our way.

The Committee on Government Operations is well on its way toward cutting the unnecessary fat out of the demands for military appropriations as well as cooperating with certain department heads who are determined to trim unnecessary spending money from appropriation bills of all kinds.

The President says balance the budget before we cut taxes. Our distinguished colleague from New York has served many, many years on the Ways and Means Committee. Before that service, he was a successful businessman. He has listened to the scare stories and the tales told by the spokesmen for the last two administrations, which, following the advice of Harry Hopkins "to tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect"—I hope that is a correct quotation—have been frightening the Congress as well as the people into a ruinous, spending, wasting, giveaway program.

The gentleman from New York says—and it seems like good sense—that we

can stop spending, get out of the red and into the black, if we will just refuse to pick the taxpayers' pockets to give the spenders the money to spend.

It is hardly fair either to the taxpayers or the spenders to keep the dollars rolling in, have money on hand, and expect either the spenders, the wasters, or the giveaway boys to keep their hands out of the barrel which has reachable dollars in it.

One thing is sure. If they do not have the money and cannot borrow it, they will not be able to spend it.

Do I hear one say, "Yes, but if they use social security money or other trust funds for everyday expenses, the debt will continue to increase."

Well, now, that may be true. I have no doubt it is. But why not tell them to keep their itchy fingers off the trust funds?

And, again, our New Deal-Democratic friends have long been telling us that the size of the Federal debt is not of much account. That I do not believe. I do think the taxpayers are entitled to relief. I do believe that the spending of these boys who are still entrenched in Government jobs will be greatly cramped if there are no funds available.

But as for our Democratic and New Deal friends on the other side of the aisle going along with either an attempt to lower taxes or to lessen appropriations, in my judgment, they will not go along with either one of the President's proposals. They will not go along to cut taxes. They will not go along to balance the budget whenever it is necessary to trim an appropriation bill. Oh, you profess to like the remedies proposed but you will not take it. Now, if you want to balance the budget, here is an opportunity to make a cut on a bill where you do not need the money, where it is already there unspent, some \$34 million, if I read the record correctly. You will not go along with a real attempt to balance the appropriations with the income and so balance the books.

But, oh, no, you want to put in some more, and you did. It just shows how you go along with the President. You would not go one-eighth of an inch unless you thought there was some political advantage in it. And I am not questioning your motives. You seem just to think that spending is the highway to economic security and just incidentally to a return to power in 1955.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, here is a fair example of an agency of the Government which has come before the Congress and asked for supplemental funds which are not needed or justified at this time. Why, this agency even asks us to appropriate over a million dollars to be expended in 1954 and 1955. The truth of the matter is this is the very thing that has been going on for the past 20 years. We appropriate money for the agencies of Government and on many occasions we have reduced their requests for appropriations, but they continue to spend as if they had every dime they had asked for. Then they have been in the habit of coming up to the Congress again when

they run out of money, asking for everything that Congress cut out and more too in many instances. They have been getting it altogether too often. If we are going to make an about-face and cut out this wasteful unnecessary spending of the taxpayers' money, right now is the best time to start. I am going to be one, and I hope the majority of the Members of Congress will help us scrutinize every request that is made not only in the general appropriation bills but also in such supplemental appropriation bills as this, and do the job that we promised the American people we would do. I hope we will stand the acid test. The truth of the matter in this instance instead of allowing the \$144,000 that is requested by this amendment, we would be perfectly justified, according to the testimony which was presented to the committee, to take a couple of hundred thousand dollars away from them which we have already appropriated for fiscal year 1953. That is what we should have done. Let us start showing the folks downtown and proving to them that we mean business. Let us show them that the day of wild, useless, reckless spending is over.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. If the action that the Congress has just taken in restoring the \$20,500,000 and making available \$145,000 which has already been appropriated unbalances your budget, I will vote to take the \$24 million or \$21½ million out of any appropriation that you call my attention to in order to balance the budget whether it is foreign aid, economic aid, or any other kind of aid.

Mr. JENSEN. All right, here we have this item of \$20,500,000, and we have this item of \$144,000 the gentleman wants to spend.

Mr. BAILEY. It has already been appropriated.

Mr. JENSEN. But multiply that by thousands and the gentleman will find it soon adds up to billions. I am going to live up to what the American people expect their Congress to do. It is mighty easy to float along with the tide, but it is pretty tough to vote against Federal aid that go to so many people and in which so many people are interested, but again I say it must be done. I am just as interested in good education as anyone in this House. I yield to no man in my desire for good education for our children. If this House does not turn down this amendment which the gentleman has just offered, then you open the floodgates again, and you say in effect, "The Committee on Appropriations, after sitting and hearing all the testimony did not know what it was doing." Then you have started to open the floodgates for all kinds of useless, needless spending of the taxpayers' dollars. Let us close the floodgates now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to belabor the House by taking 5 minutes.

Before my colleagues vote on this matter I want to have it clear. This is not asking for the appropriation of any new money. They have \$10 million of the \$60 million that we gave them unobligated.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, this will take money out of the Treasury that would not otherwise be spent, and it will just provide for a lot of people who are doing duplicating work that the present architect which the local school authorities have hired, should do. That is just how it will work.

Mr. BAILEY. May I answer the distinguished gentleman from New York by saying that there is need for your having technical supervision over the expenditure of these millions of dollars.

Mr. TABER. Well, it has already been provided for.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me give the gentleman a little history of what is going on. A few weeks ago the community facilities of the General Services received a set of plans and specifications from an architect for a school building costing a couple of hundred thousand dollars. He made provision for a heating plant, but never made any provision for a basement to put the heating plant in. Another set of plans came in for a two-story school building providing for elevators. Are you going to let them build that kind of facilities? The object was to build the bare necessities for classroom service. You have got to have some supervision over these things. How are you going to spend all of these millions of dollars without some kind of sensible supervision?

Mr. TABER. You have \$750,000 already provided for.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I am a little confused about one statement which the gentleman made. He said we had to provide \$144,000 now because of the action which was just taken to include \$20,500,000.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman got that implication from what I said, he is entirely wrong. I was not mentioning the \$24 million. What I said was that if the House by voting \$20,500,000 supplemental for maintenance and operations of the schools unbalanced the budget, I would vote with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] to take that \$20,500,000 out of some appropriation for foreign economic aid or foreign military aid. I was not talking about this \$24 million.

Mr. FORD. In other words, there is no direct connection between the action taken by the House with reference to Public Law 874 and your amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. None whatever. It is construction and not maintenance and operation.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman says this service is to cut out a lot of the frills in these high schools, but if the gentleman will make a study of the Hoffman-Boston High School over in Ar-

lington he will find one of the most lush high schools in the entire United States. That was supervised by this agency.

Mr. BAILEY. Was that not built by local funds? The Federal Government only contributed toward the construction of that building.

Mr. BUSBEY. But that is how they perform on many of these high schools.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The language of the amendment that the gentleman has offered takes an additional \$145,000 out of the Treasury, and it does not confine that expenditure to the funds that have already been provided for the construction of the school.

Mr. BAILEY. That is the intention of the amendment: They transfer moneys already in their hands.

Mr. TABER. That is not what it says.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the action taken in restoring to this bill most of the \$24 million the committee had taken out—restoring some \$20 million of that amount—is a mistake and entirely unwarranted.

With this amount restored, the Office of Education would receive some \$64 million for the fiscal year. This is as much as the total spent in 9 war and postwar years under the Lanham Act.

The increase in this appropriation is a Democratic proposal and move. It could not—and cannot—be made unless there are Republicans willing to go along with it and willing to default on the Republican pledge of economy, a balanced budget, and reduced taxes. We can expect the Democrats to continue to try in every way possible to restore appropriation committee reductions and to defeat economy efforts. They will get away with it if Republicans are willing to aid them.

The Office of Education can get along very well without this added \$20 million item. The original appropriation is adequate to see the agency through, even allowing for needs of the defense-impacted areas. Of course that does not mean that the Office of Education cannot spend the extra millions if you vote them. It can and will even spend some of the millions on schemes to promote additional spending at the local level—schemes such as that brought to light just this week before the board of education in the city of Kalamazoo, Mich., in my district.

I have here an article from a Kalamazoo newspaper which describes a request from the Federal Office of Education to the Kalamazoo Board of Education. It asks the board to "make a comprehensive study of their long-range educational needs and to develop school construction master plans based on these needs covering the period up to the 1959-60 school year."

The newspaper article reports that the request has been given a very cool reception by the board of education. Little disposition was shown to welcome this Federal intrusion, involving substantial expense to the local school district, par-

ticularly since the board has already been studying its school building needs and formulating plans to meet them.

One member of the board—I know him personally—is quoted as summing up his feelings as follows:

I am in favor of forgetting it myself. We are not looking for any Federal aid; we would oppose it if it were offered to us. This smacks very much to me like the previous administration trying to take control of the schools and make them subservient to the Federal Government.

I am certainly opposed to appropriation increases which will encourage activities of this sort. Besides, as I have said on many occasions, I will not support so-called Federal aid programs because there is no such thing as Federal aid. Government is not a producer but a spender—and all too often a wastrel as well. It does not create wealth. All that it dispenses with lavish hand has been, or must be, collected from the real producers in the form of taxes. And for every dollar collected from the taxpayers back home they get about 25 cents in misnamed Federal aid; the rest, 75 cents, stays here in Washington for administration and jobs for the faithful.

May I remind you, and particularly my Republican colleagues, of the plea made by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message:

Getting control of the budget requires also that State and local governments and interested groups of citizens restrain themselves in their demands upon Congress.

It should not be too much to expect Congress—and especially those on this side of the aisle who have a special obligation to the voters in the matter—to set an example in exercising the self-restraint for which President Eisenhower pleaded. Certainly the field of public education, traditionally subject to local and State control and financing, offers an ideal area for practicing restraint in the demands upon Congress.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 55, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

The amount authorized by the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1953, to be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance", is increased from "\$60,500,000" to "\$62,500,000."

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE: Page 7, line 15, strike out "\$62,500,000" and insert "\$62,759,000."

[Mr. TEAGUE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] could rightfully offer his amendment after the reading of \$340,000,000 on line 18. If I am correct in that assumption I ask the House for unanimous consent that his amendment be considered at that point and that his remarks on his amendment follow.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I ask this question, Mr. Chairman? I think probably what the gentleman from Texas wants to do is to add \$2,000,000; is that the correct amount?

Mr. TEAGUE. No, \$295,000, which the United States Office of Education asked for.

Mr. TABER. Is the amendment withdrawn?

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will rule that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may be reoffered after the reading of line 18, we would be glad to agree to that arrangement.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, if that is the proper place, it be reoffered there.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman should withdraw his amendment and reoffer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may withdraw the amendment and reoffer it at the proper place. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the amendment?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I ask the gentleman from Texas what relation this has to the work of the Veterans' Administration, which carries on, presumably, some inspection service of these schools? Is it presumed that this amount of money and this amount of service shall be subtracted from the Veterans' Administration at the same time it is placed in the Office of Education?

Mr. TEAGUE. No; the Veterans' Administration does not carry on this same inspection service and approval of students. One of the biggest troubles in the whole bill was the approval of schools that were not good schools. We were charging the United States Office of Education with the job of accrediting schools.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman says the trouble was with the approval of schools. By whom?

Mr. TEAGUE. By the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I should like to support the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. As the result of all the billions spent on the veterans' education and training program, we asked the Veterans' Administration if

they had ever consulted the Office of Education with respect to standards in the operation of schools for veterans with a view of improving them and having better methods of education. Officials of the Veterans' Administration replied that they had never consulted the Office of Education. Therefore, it was written into the new law that the Veterans' Administration should consult with the Office of Education and use their technical assistance in formulating school policies and also in inspecting the schools to see that their activities are carried out in a high-type fashion. The provision of the statute in this regard was made mandatory, not permissive. In other words, the purpose of this legislation was to eliminate the waste and extravagance which had heretofore developed in the program. So we called upon the Veterans' Administration to utilize the Office of Education in helping improve the veterans educational and training program.

It is estimated that one quarter of a billion dollars will be expended under the educational program of the Korean GI bill in its peak year. Therefore, it would certainly be false economy to fail to see to it that the proper supervision of such a vast program is not maintained.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUSBEY. Would the Chair rule on where this amendment should be offered and how it should be handled, so the gentleman from Texas will have an opportunity to get his amendment before the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asked that the amendment be withdrawn and the Committee has agreed to that. Now, if someone will ask that it be passed over and that it be brought up in its proper place, we can proceed in that manner.

Mr. TABER. The trouble, to me, is that if you offer the amendment at this point you put it in under the heading of "Grants to States" instead of under the "Office of Education," where an amendment has already been adopted to the bill, so it is not in very good shape if you try to put it in line 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment being withdrawn, there is nothing now before the Chair. If the gentleman wants to reoffer it, he may do so at the place he thinks proper.

Mr. TEAGUE. In the report on page 14 under the heading of "Federal Security Agency" it says "Office of Education, salaries and expenses," and on page 7, lines 9 and 10, under "Social Security Administration," it says "salaries and expenses." I assumed the amendment went in at that place. Will the Chair rule whether that is proper or improper?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Texas must prepare his own amendment and offer it at the place he believes it should be offered.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment

be withdrawn and be offered at the proper place.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman wants to do it, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] tells me that he is willing to let the gentleman from Texas return to line 7, where the amendment should have been offered, and offer the amendment which the clerk of the committee has prepared for him so that he might have it in order. If the gentleman wants to do that, all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make that unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TABER. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I make the request for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE: On page 7, line 7, insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, Office of Education,' \$259,000."

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to speak on the amendment. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is an honest difference of opinion regarding this particular law as it applies to the functions of the Office of Education. I respect the views of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and want to compliment him on the fine work his committee did last year in going into the veterans' education program. I was very happy to hear him state, in his support of the amendment, that the law under which the Veterans' Administration had to operate was faulty and it was not altogether the fault of the Veterans' Administration that a substantial amount of Federal funds was spent rather unwisely. But the question is with respect to the functions of the Office of Education under Public Law 550.

I refer you to section 253 of the law, which specifically states:

For the purposes of this title, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized, accrediting agencies and associations.

We, on the committee, thought that since the Office of Education has been dealing with these accrediting agencies for many years, it would not be much of a job for them to compile a list of recognized agencies and associations for the Veterans' Administration.

The gentleman also referred to section 244 of the law. Let me read that, if I may:

The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 243, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreement, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and im-

proving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this title.

What has the Office of Education been doing all these years, if they are not in a position to counsel the Veterans' Administration without setting up a super-agency down there to take care of a lot more bureaucrats? They are transferring to this program employees for whom they had no jobs because the work they were doing was in connection with materials allocations—a function that is being discontinued. They also went out and recruited social workers and others who had no experience whatsoever in the field of education.

This amendment calls for \$259,000. Let me state, for the benefit of the House, that the Bureau of the Budget originally agreed to let them have \$380,000. Then they thought they could get along with \$289,000. When they came before our Subcommittee on Appropriations, they thought they could get along with \$259,000, the exact amount contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. When I visited the Office of Education last Friday, they agreed that 29 positions could handle the job as they wanted to handle it and said they would need only \$228,000. The Veterans' Administration is in this field. They have made mistakes; I can criticize the Veterans' Administration as well as anyone else, but they have had experience. They have had the advantage of experience which the Office of Education had not had. When the Pennsylvania Railroad engineer ran a train through Union Station a few weeks ago, they did not fire the engineer for something for which he was not responsible. When Captain Carlson's ship, *The Enterprise*, went down in the Atlantic, they did not deprive Captain Carlson of another ship. He did not lose that ship through any fault of his. The Veterans' Administration was saddled with a law that they could not have administered without some waste of public funds. That was the original GI bill. I say the Office of Education does not need this money. They are fully equipped to render the service to the Veterans' Administration required of them by law without any additional funds whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] that what troubles me most is a lack of understanding of the relationship between the Bureau of Education and the work of the Veterans' Administration. In the supplemental bill that we now have before us there is an item of \$5 million given to the Veterans' Administration, which is specifically limited to be used for the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation and Education and the loan guaranty, which means that roughly around four million dollars would probably go for the talk we are now discussing.

The work of the Veterans' Administration has unquestionably been faulty in the past on this function, but thanks to

the work of the committee, headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], it has very much improved.

Now it is proposed, without any further discussion on the floor, to give this additional money to the Office of Education, which I am inclined to think has money that can be used for that. But whether or not they have the money, it is to be turned over to the Office of Education, without sufficient chance for consideration of the ability and qualifications to handle this job any better than the Veterans' Administration is handling it now. If the Members will turn to page 269 of the hearings, I would like to read briefly, and then I will yield to the gentleman. The chairman asked about this man who was to handle this for the Office of Education. The chairman said:

Has Mr. O'Brien any accomplishments in the field of education?

And the answer was:

Not in the sense of being a leading educational authority but, if you will pardon me, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is the principal job to be done here.

The CHAIRMAN. I got the impression from your statement that that was one of the reasons why they wanted to put this work in the Office of Education and take it out of the Veterans' Administration.

The answer was:

That is right. But the management of this program is something that does not necessarily require a detailed knowledge of the procedures in education, although he knows a good deal about education.

I might be willing to agree with that, but what the committee wants to know is, Should we appropriate money for the Veterans' Administration in a supplemental bill and then come on the floor without any coordination between the two appropriations and give a quarter of a million dollars to the Office of Education to do something which we are also financing in the Veterans' Administration? With all regard to my friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who has been doing a beautiful job, I could have wished there could have been a little more discussion about the coordination of the work between the Veterans' Administration and the Office of Education. I can assure him that the Veterans' Administration is doing a lot better job than it was a year or so ago before he started his work.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. I want to say to the gentleman that this was very carefully considered by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a committee over in the Senate. The object of this legislation was an attempt to put the actual educational features in the Office of Education. The Veterans' Administration has to make certain checks and clearances as to attendance and that sort of thing, whether it is a good school before the veteran goes there, and whether he attends.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will let me interrupt, let them continue checking on attendance and details of

that kind, but they are looking into the qualifications of the school, and they are entitled to consider legitimate schools for the education of veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE. But the standard of fitness is determined and set up by the Office of Education, which is the proper place for it to be.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will go along with the gentleman on that; I think the gentleman is right, but I am also convinced in my own mind—and I have not seen any evidence to the contrary—that the Veterans' Administration is also doing the same thing and that we are providing money for it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. That problem is for the educational department. According to the testimony of Mr. McGrath, the head of it, he does not seem to feel that it is necessary for a man to have had any experience or know anything about education in order to operate the thing, and you are turning the money over to an agency that comes right out and says that it will not do what your committee laid out for it to do; so you might better leave it to the Veterans' Administration than to the Commissioner of Education with that kind of setup.

Mr. TEAGUE. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that I have read the hearings and I got no such interpretation of what Mr. McGrath said.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will look at page 269—

Mr. TEAGUE. I have read that.

Mr. TABER. The gist of this testimony is that it does not necessarily require a detailed knowledge of the procedures in education to determine whether a school is a good school.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that this amendment is to line 7 on page 7 of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It follows line 7, page 7; that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Is the amendment in order at that point?

The CHAIRMAN. It has been offered for debate.

Mr. GROSS. But is the amendment in order in line 7 on page 7?

The CHAIRMAN. It is in order at this particular time while it is being debated; yes.

Mr. GROSS. You cannot amend line 7 of this bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and to answer two questions raised by the gentleman from California. The first question is whether or not moneys have already been appropriated for this work under the Veterans' Administration item. The answer is no; the appropriation made to the Veterans' Administration is to take care of the Veterans' Administration in administering veterans' entitlements, in making payments to the

various schools, or rather to the veterans who pay the schools. That administrative work is taken care of by the Veterans' Administration appropriation. On the other hand there is the question of determining the kind of schools that shall be used, and for that purpose it is necessary to investigate those schools, which has been turned over to the Office of Education.

The second question is: Is it necessary that they have an education man do it? The answer given in the committee, which was quoted on the floor, is correct, because they are not only determining the qualifications of established educational institutions, that would be easy, but they are determining the character and qualifications of schools like barber schools, trade schools, and other technical schools of all sorts, regarding which there was a great deal of criticism when the Veterans' Administration was handling it. That is the work, along with advise and guidance, that the Office of Education must do in connection with veterans' education and rehabilitation, so they had these men do it.

Mr. TEAGUE and his committee have been complimented for what they have done in this matter, but compliments are not enough; we have given this work to the Office of Education and they need funds to carry that work out. I think they are doing a very good job in spite of the fact that they have not been getting the money with which to do it. In order to do it they have had to use funds intended for other work, and they have had to take men from the Office of Education who were engaged in other work in that agency, work that is now suffering, and which will continue to suffer unless we give them the money for this new purpose.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I am not going to take the full 5 minutes to which I am entitled. I merely want to say that I am in favor of the Teague amendment. I think the committee went too far in denying all these funds.

When the Committee on Appropriations takes the attitude that when a bill is passed by a previous Congress and then the Bureau of the Budget authorizes the Department of Education to spend some funds pending a supplemental appropriation bill that will come before the Congress, then tells the Department of Education or the people down here in Washington to go back and absorb this two hundred and some odd thousand dollars that they have expended for this particular program, that committee is going beyond the bounds of reason.

I think the committee in denying these funds today is just undoing the work of the Teague committee of the past couple of years. Everyone in Congress applauds the work of the former Teague committee in straightening out the Korean GI bill of rights that we passed last year. If we do not appropriate any funds in this particular bill for the Department of Education to carry out these functions that have been given to them by agreement of the Veterans' Adminis-

tration and by agreement of the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the House and Senate, we are just undoing some of the good work that was accomplished by the Teague committee. That is all you are accomplishing by denying these funds.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from Rhode Island knows that there is no man in the House of Representatives I have more respect for than himself. It was a great pleasure to serve under him when he was chairman of this committee for the past 2 years. However, this is a little different than asking them to absorb. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, there was room for an honest difference of opinion and that was not to absorb this \$259,000. It was whether or not the law really meant that they should go in and do all the things that they are presuming to do. I appreciate that the Office of Education is going to grab off everything it can, just like the fight it made some years ago to take the free lunch program over from the Department of Agriculture, or anything else to build up a bureau down there. I think this thing should be handled according to law under the Veterans' Administration, using the facilities of the Office of Education and taking advantage of any suggestions that agency can make.

Mr. FOGARTY. The question before the House is that the Bureau of the Budget authorized the Department of Education to expend some of the funds they had appropriated in this fiscal year to carry out the dictates of the Congress in connection with this particular law.

Mr. BUSBEY. But the Bureau of the Budget can be wrong, too. It originally offered them \$380,000 for a job they admit themselves they can do for \$228,000. It is their prerogative to do it.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is a job given to the Department of Education. Now you come in here and say: You should not have done it, it does not belong in your department, and even though you spent a couple hundred thousand dollars out of the funds you already have, you should not have done it.

The gentleman from Illinois knows that in the past 3 or 4 years we have always cut the appropriation requests of the Department of Education pretty hard. I do not know exactly what we cut them a year ago, but I think we cut them about \$300,000 in their request for appropriations for salaries and expenses for this fiscal year. We have cut them down pretty low.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. The work that the Office of Education has already done, whether you give the money back or not, will return to the taxpayer ten times this amount of money in getting the thing started where you have nothing but good schools approved. Has any Member of Congress received any letters

about veterans going to these fly-by-night schools? I do not believe you have. The Office of Education has done an excellent job on that.

Mr. FOGARTY. The reason we have not had letters was because of the action taken by the gentleman's committee in the past year in holding those extensive hearings.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The facts are that the work of these accredited schools and colleges has about been accomplished. The testimony which was given to the committee proved that this work is almost completed. The schools have been accredited and I think a good job has been done, and the committee felt that there was no particular need for any more money for this purpose in addition to what had already been appropriated. The testimony proved to our entire satisfaction that they had sufficient funds and sufficient personnel to continue to do this job.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services," \$10,000,000.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FENTON: Page 10, line 11, after "\$10,000,000," strike out the period and insert a colon and "Provided, That \$729,000 of this amount be provided for contractual hospital beds in Philadelphia, Pa."

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the House at this time of the deplorable conditions existing in the Philadelphia area with respect to the inadequate number of hospital beds for veterans.

With a veteran population in Philadelphia of around 500,000, the Bureau of the Budget has seen fit to allow a maximum of 500 hospital beds for that area as of April 1 this year. This will be accomplished with the complete activation of the new VA hospital in Philadelphia, supposedly on that date. This will "phase out" the contractual beds in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital of 400 beds.

Now, when the new VA hospital was authorized, it was to accommodate 1,000. In 1949 when the Executive order took 16,000 beds out of the total beds for the whole country, they cut the Philadelphia VA hospital back to 500. In fact they not only cut back the Philadelphia Hospital 500 but they also did the same thing with the Pittsburgh Hospital and cut out the Harrisburg Hospital al-

together. In other words, Pennsylvania suffered a cut of 14 percent of the 16,000 beds under that general order.

I feel sure that if you will look over the comparative chart on page 141 of the hearings, you will see a rather glowing defect in hospital beds for the State of Pennsylvania for its veteran population of 1,418,000 in contrast to some other States.

Now please believe me when I say we have no quarrel with any other State when we make these comparisons because, in my estimation, eligible veterans are entitled to receive adequate hospitalization. We do, however, think that Pennsylvania has been discriminated against and I believe the comparison will so prove.

| | Veteran popula- tion | VA beds | Other beds | Total |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------|---------------|-------|
| Pennsylvania..... | 1,418,000 | 2,356 | 742 | 3,098 |
| New York..... | 1,927,000 | 4,913 | 1,748 | 6,661 |
| California..... | 1,476,000 | 4,449 | ----- | 4,449 |
| Illinois..... | 1,238,000 | 3,496 | 1,012 | 4,508 |
| Texas..... | 953,000 | 3,864 | 500 | 4,364 |
| Ohio..... | 1,028,000 | 2,307 | 996 | 3,303 |
| Michigan..... | 828,000 | 1,563 | 496 | 2,059 |
| Massachusetts..... | 583,000 | 1,256 | ----- | 1,256 |
| Indiana..... | 415,000 | 1,186 | ----- | 1,186 |
| Georgia..... | 352,000 | 1,494 | ----- | 1,494 |
| Florida..... | 329,000 | 1,353 | ----- | 1,353 |
| Missouri..... | 542,000 | 1,240 | 496 | 1,736 |
| Virginia..... | 324,000 | 1,604 | ----- | 1,604 |
| Tennessee..... | 369,000 | 3,055 | ----- | 3,055 |
| Louisiana..... | 289,000 | 1,611 | 493 | 2,104 |
| West Virginia..... | 218,000 | 1,300 | ----- | 1,300 |
| District of Colum- bia..... | 221,000 | 835 | ----- | 835 |

In the case of Philadelphia today, we claim that as of April 1 we will not be adequately provided for with hospital beds. We believe that the naval hospital contract beds—400—should be provided for and continued. This would give us less than 900 beds in that area when the new VA hospital is fully activated.

Now we are grateful to the subcommittee for the time given the Pennsylvania Members of Congress, including our Senators and the Representatives of the American Legion Department of Pennsylvania in their hearings.

We especially appreciate the action they have taken with regards to the mandate they have given the VA in the report:

The committee has allowed the full amount of the estimate of five million for operating expenses in connection with hospitals. In connection with this part of the estimate, the committee specifically directs that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs take such immediate steps as may be essential to furnish adequate hospitalization for needy veterans in the Philadelphia area.

However, the situation is so critical in the Philadelphia area that we believe, from past experience, that we should specifically spell out what the Philadelphia area requires. I therefore present this amendment to accomplish just that.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to specifically allocate \$729,000 for contract beds in the Philadelphia area.

There is a veteran population of about one-half million in Philadelphia out of a total of 1½ million veterans in the State of Pennsylvania.

As I have said, there is something like 3,098 beds for the whole State of Penn-

sylvania. Now they propose to phase out the contract beds in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital which will cut that number of beds to around 2,600 or 2,700 for Pennsylvania.

I am informed that there is a waiting list—applications—of around 1,500 or 1,600 for the Philadelphia area of eligible veterans. Now where will those boys be sent when the new Philadelphia VA hospital is full? They will have their applications sent to veterans' hospitals in other sections of the country, thus adding to the waiting lists of such veterans hospitals as Richmond, Va.; Wilmington, Del.; Wilkes-Barre and Lebanon, Pa.; Martinsburg, W. Va.; and Fort Howard, Baltimore, East Orange. They have according to the adjutant of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania, allocated seven beds out in Dayton, Ohio, for patients from the Philadelphia area. What they are in effect really doing is increasing the waiting lists at all these hospitals.

I can see no excuse in sending veterans from Philadelphia to those remote places when we have a well staffed hospital such as the Philadelphia Naval Hospital which has always taken care of 400 to 600 veterans from that city and its environs. Moreover, it was originally designed, I understand, to do that very thing.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. Of course, the situation which the gentleman has described in Pennsylvania is like the situation we have in Tennessee and in other States where we have several hospitals which have been closed down because of the lack of hospital beds and appropriations to have doctors in those hospitals. I wonder if the gentleman would be in favor of Admiral Boone's suggestion to provide \$10 million additional so that they can open up these hospital beds in Philadelphia, Pa., Tennessee, California, and other parts of the country.

Mr. FENTON. I certainly am in favor of opening beds for veterans wherever they are located.

Mr. SUTTON. I wonder if the gentleman would withdraw his amendment then and go along with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] to restore the \$10 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, the naval hospital in Philadelphia has a bed capacity of around 2,000 and when this phasing out routine is completed, they will have something like 800 empty beds.

The city of Philadelphia is one of the greatest medical centers in the world. It has six medical schools and when the VA hospital for Philadelphia was authorized for 1,000 beds that was one of the main factors; because of its supply of medical men to staff a first class hospital.

I have pointed out that Pennsylvania has been discriminated against in the

matter of hospital beds for veterans. I do not say that it was done deliberately, nevertheless the veterans of Philadelphia and their families, in my opinion, should not be subjected to such kind of jockeying around.

Where the responsibility lies for this condition is anyone's guess, but I am of the firm opinion that it lies in the Bureau of the Budget. Some may say the VA. Maybe they have something there. But I do say, without any fear of contradiction, that when the Bureau of the Budget says "That's it," the departments of Government and bureaus do their bidding. Right or wrong they do what the Bureau of the Budget commands.

In this instance it was the Bureau of the Budget who did not permit the VA to ask for a supplemental. I called the Bureau of the Budget on the phone and they put up the old argument and were adamant, although they did at my suggestion have a conference with the VA medical authorities and the VA budget director. However, nothing for the welfare of the Philadelphia area happened.

Members of the House, that is why I make this approach to securing adequate hospital beds for the veterans in the city of Philadelphia. They are entitled to this consideration and not tossed all over the map when in need.

I therefore trust that you will approve this amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I want the situation to be very clear to the members of the committee. The Veterans' Administration asked for \$5 million. We gave them \$5 million.

In the report which accompanies the bill we said, "In connection with this part of the estimate," which has to do with the hospitals, "the committee specifically directs the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to take such immediate steps as may be essential to furnish adequate hospitalization for needy veterans in the Philadelphia area." The committee recommends that we do not attempt to earmark, either in money or number of beds. The gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. FENTON] is very much interested in the veterans, and we commend him for that, but the gentleman is taking figures which the Veterans' Administration furnished to the Pennsylvania delegation, on request, for information on a specific number of beds, which was not the amount of money, in the opinion of the subcommittee, needed for the beds which are to be made available in that area.

At the beginning of the fiscal year there were 350 beds available in the naval hospital. That will be reduced by March 31 of this year to 100 beds. At the same time, beginning on the first of the year, the beds in the new Veterans' hospital would be activated by 150 beds, until at the end of the fiscal year they would have 488 beds. The process was intended to take the naval hospital beds and put the veterans in the Veterans' hospitals. The process has not been

rapid enough to balance the available beds. The actual number of beds at issue is not 400 beds, for which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] desires to furnish money, but is the difference between the number of beds which will be made available and the number which the delegation from Pennsylvania, with whom we agreed, feels should be made available. Our belief is that we will get better results if we keep to the wording of the bill, and not attempt to enter into the administration of the number of beds in the hospitals. We have reasons for that. It is a complicated subject. We are entering into a discussion of what constitutes entitlement and service connection. We are entering into a discussion of whether the beds should be in the naval hospital or whether they should be in the Veterans' hospital. Those Members who are as familiar with the naval hospitals as I am with the Veterans' hospitals will agree that there are times when those beds should be in the naval hospitals on contract. The naval hospital could be rated as a second-rate hospital by the medical board, because it has too many vacant beds.

I am suggesting that we do not adopt this, much as we believe in the objective that the gentleman desires. Particularly I do not want the Congress on the floor of the House in this way to enter into a discussion of what constitutes entitlement and what constitutes service connection, because that is something the Congress will have to face very soon, and something which requires a great deal more time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the distinguished gentleman if it was not the unanimous opinion of the committee that we wanted to go all-out and give to our friend from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON, and those veterans in Philadelphia, everything that was humanly possible? You directed them in your report to rectify that situation immediately. Does not the gentleman have every reason to believe that within the next day or two the Veterans' Administration will do exactly that?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I believe that; and I put that in the RECORD yesterday; but I desire also to make clear—

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Veterans' Administration within the next day or two, and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], will contact them—have not rectified that situation which exists in Philadelphia, will the gentleman call his committee together and get the Veterans' Administration people before his committee to see that it is done?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Very willingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want you to turn to page 156 of the hearings. This has to do with the amount of money which the gentleman from Pennsylvania includes in his request.

The \$729,000 is discussed on page 155 and the following pages, and we say to the Administrator: "The sum you really need to take care of the request of veterans in Philadelphia is \$256,000"—which was all they actually could prove, because it costs \$14.25 a day to rent a bed in the veterans' hospital. Take a pencil and paper from your pocket and figure it out for yourself. They simply say: "We do not attempt to answer that; all we did, we got a request from the Pennsylvania delegation to tell them how much it would cost to take care of 400 people." And that was the figure they gave. We said to them: "Then, no matter what the amount necessary would have been, you would have given this figure of \$729,000 and you would not have told them that that was more than was needed." And they said: "No; we just answer what the request was."

So we have two things: First, the amount is too much; second, we believe that it should not be handled this way.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to express the great satisfaction and thanks of the Pennsylvania delegation whose members are interested in this problem, to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and the Members on both sides of the subcommittee for their unquestioned interest in this matter of adequate hospitalization for veterans living in the Philadelphia area. They have undertaken in this report to correct that inequity and the unjust situation which exists in the Philadelphia area.

Please bear in mind that at this moment there are to be hundreds of vacant beds available for ill veterans in Government hospitals in the Philadelphia area. The beds are vacant because the Veterans' Administration will not pay to the Navy the money which is necessary as rental for these beds necessary to the care of veterans from Philadelphia and for whom treatment is already authorized. They are taking these cases from the Philadelphia area and sending them to New York, New Jersey, and to other hospitals in Pennsylvania; thus they are causing a serious situation in those areas where they cannot take their own veterans. So I commend the committee for recognizing that something must be done.

I address myself now to what the committee have undertaken to do and to see whether what they have tried to do in this report is adequate. Does the committee's action assure hospitalization for veterans from the Philadelphia area in Philadelphia area hospitals to help the veteran from the Philadelphia area?

The committee had placed in this report the following statement:

The committee specifically directs that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs take such

immediate steps as may be essential to furnish adequate hospitalization for needy veterans in the Philadelphia area.

Now, we know from the experience of the Veterans' Administration acting under the instructions of the Budget Bureau quite frequently do the things they want to and disregard the will and the intention of Congress. Will the Veterans' Administration under this directive do as the committee want?

I believe that the Veterans' Administration will take the necessary action so that the needy veterans who live in the Philadelphia area will be given adequate hospitalization; but I fear it will not be done within the Philadelphia area. I contend that this statement that the veterans in the Philadelphia area are to have adequate hospitalization will be interpreted as meaning that a veteran living in that area shall have adequate hospitalization and that the adequate hospitalization may be furnished in New York, Ohio, or other parts of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, or elsewhere. That is exactly what they have been doing. We want this changed, and I believe the committee does also. In that connection I would like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], chairman of the committee, whether it is intended that the Veterans' Administration under this directive is to provide necessary and adequate medical service for veterans in Philadelphia and within the Philadelphia area?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would be very glad to read the record if I had the time. My answer is, we agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman agrees that the Veterans' Administration as a result of the directive of the gentleman's committee is to provide that care.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In Philadelphia.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is in the hearings.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the statement made with respect to the need of adequate medical care and hospitalization for veterans in the Philadelphia area which includes all southern New Jersey now served by the naval hospital at Philadelphia. The matter is one that is serious. The curtailment of service to the veterans in the south Jersey area has awakened great interest upon the part of all veteran organizations located in this section of New Jersey. We appreciate the effort that is being made in this bill to provide the facilities for southern New Jersey it is entitled to have.

There is no money being expended by our Government that is more necessary or more proper than that being expended for medical and hospital facilities for our veterans, and the amount should at all times be adequate. There is no valid excuse or justification for any less sum.

During the past year it has become increasingly clear that the Congress cut

the amount for medical, hospital, and domiciliary services for veterans below the amount that was necessary to give the adequate care our veterans are entitled to have. The number to be cared for is constantly increasing. Failure to recognize this fact is doing an injustice to the men and women who have served our country in its hour of emergency.

This inadequacy, in the amount last appropriated for this purpose in the appropriation bill adopted by the previous Congress, must and should be corrected. Those of us who are in constant touch with veteran affairs in the south Jersey area are fully aware of what the curtailment of medical and hospital facilities for the veterans in this area, as a result of the inadequacy of the last appropriation bill, has meant to our veterans.

The supplemental appropriations presented to us in the present bill to remedy the deficiency of the bill passed last year is welcome. The committee is entitled to be commended for the action it has taken. The committee report leaves no doubt that the veterans in the area of south Jersey being served by the facilities provided at the Philadelphia naval hospital will be increased by the additional \$5 million provided in this bill.

The report is very definite in this respect. It says: "The committee has allowed the full amount of the estimate of \$5 million for operating expenses in connection with hospitals. In connection with this part of the estimate the committee specifically directs that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs take such immediate steps as may be essential to furnish adequate hospitalization for needy veterans in the Philadelphia area."

The bill should have the support of all who believe in providing adequate care for our veterans.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman state that the appropriations now made for the Veterans' Administration will be adequate for the supplying of the proper number of beds in all areas other than the one the gentleman has been speaking about? I have in mind a situation in New York where there has been vigorous complaint and protest from veterans' organizations that the number of beds in the New York area is woefully inadequate to take care of the needs there.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The New York area will be helped by the operation of this directive because patients now being sent to New York from Pennsylvania will be detained in Philadelphia. Other than that, I cannot answer the question.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If New York is short of funds, this is not the time to

fight for it. The time to do that is to go before the subcommittee on appropriations when it considers appropriations for the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. CELLER. I still ask whether this supplemental appropriation will provide for an adequate number of beds to be made available in New York? I am interested in New York as well as the other Members are interested in Philadelphia.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. As a result of Dr. FENTON's amendment and the directive which the committee has inserted in the report to the effect that Pennsylvania patients will be retained in Pennsylvania hospitals and not sent to New York hospitals, New York will be helped by the amendment.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DORN of New York. Does the gentleman know that in the Fort Hamilton Hospital I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is discussing at the present time there are two full floors of beds that are not being used because of inadequate funds? The question I have in mind is this: Will these funds be used to reuse those beds? There is a terrific need in the New York area; those beds are needed but no funds are being supplied by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do not know the answer to that question. I hope the bill includes sufficient money to permit the use of these beds for veterans within the New York area.

(Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I will not take all the 5 minutes which the chairman has allotted me, but I do want to supplement briefly the remarks just made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and to add to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has said. The Philadelphia area properly comprises the district of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], right across the river, in Camden, and also my district in southern New Jersey which depends largely on facilities in Philadelphia. As the gentleman has said, it is one of the world's great medical centers and it is proper that medical facilities, should be concentrated there. In the veterans' hospital at Lyons, N. J., there is a situation where there is literally standing room only. In the new veterans' hospital in the Oranges, in New Jersey, just completed a few short months ago, my understanding is that that facility is not yet caring for an adequate number. In the Wilmington, Del., veterans' hospital, to which may district also has resort and which is doing a fine job in that area, I am told now that they are limited to taking surgical emergencies, so crowded are their conditions. So, there is in the Philadelphia area as well as the area I represent in southern New Jersey a very acute need for additional hospital beds. I wanted to add that to what the gentlemen said about the situation because I

know of my own knowledge that the need is acute, and when we return to the House I shall ask unanimous consent to insert certain memoranda which I have received from veterans in my area in that connection. I hope what the committee has done in this connection will be adequate; that their direction to the Veterans' Administration will at least temporarily serve to help us. But, I do want to emphasize further what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], has just stated, and that is that the real fight must come in this connection when we discuss fiscal 1954.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Let me say that the gentleman from New Jersey points out a fact that there is a shortage of hospital beds for veterans in this country, and I would like to remind the Members of the House that some years ago the House of Representatives reinstated a 16,000 bed program which the President arbitrarily cut from the hospital program.

Mr. HAND. I am very glad the gentleman mentioned that, because to my knowledge that is entirely true and it ought to be stated at this point. The gentleman is always well-informed on veterans needs, and I thank him for his observation.

Sometime ago the deplorable shortage of hospital beds for veterans in southern New Jersey was called to my attention by Anthony J. Volpe, the service officer of Cape May County Veterans' Bureau. He wrote me as follows:

CAPE MAY COUNTY VETERANS' BUREAU,
Cape May Court House, N. J.,
November 24, 1952.

Re VA hospital beds.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,

Second New Jersey Congressional District,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAND: I have before me a copy of letter from Surgeon General, United States Navy, which was forwarded to you on or about October 27, 1952. According to said letter from the Surgeon General, United States Navy, the Veterans' Administration themselves are guilty of not taking advantage of hospital bed facilities at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital. I quote the last paragraph of said letter, "The Navy is willing to continue provision of beds for veterans at this hospital as it has in the past, and can do so for the foreseeable future to the extent these are desired by the Veterans' Administration."

It seems more apparent to the undersigned that the Veterans' Administration, throughout the entire East, are cutting not only bed (hospital) facilities for veterans, but they are also cutting personnel allocations for already existing and new facilities for hospital and medical facilities for veterans of all categories, both service-connected and non-service-connected. In fact, I have recently spoken with an official from the Lyons VA Mental Hospital, and have been informed officially that they have now cut down their hospital bed facilities for mental cases to the tune of 112. The Lyons VA Hospital had a bed capacity of 2,009 patients; they now have capacity for only 1,897. According to the official at Lyons, this is due entirely to cut in personnel. I may emphatically state that we, particularly we in this area, and all the areas served by the Lyons VA Hospital have always been confronted with a long waiting list. In recent months that waiting list has

been as high as 700 men waiting for a bed at Lyons VA mental hospital. Now with the cut of 112 beds the situation is going to become more adverse. As yet, the undersigned has not received any official notification that the new VA hospital at East Orange, N. J., will be able to operate at full capacity. By that I mean, the new hospital at East Orange was built to handle 950 patients. As of 2 weeks ago our department headquarters stated that they can only maintain 250 patients due to the fact that they do not have sufficient personnel to handle full capacity for which the hospital was built. The new hospital which will be opened very shortly at Philadelphia will probably be a 350- or 400-bed hospital. This will not in any way alleviate the hospital bed shortages for the Philadelphia area and our area in any manner. If, however, the new hospital with a capacity of 400 beds will be able to operate at full capacity, and if the Veterans' Administration requests from the Department of the Navy the use of the 300 beds which are available to them, we will then have at least 700 or 750 beds available to use in the Philadelphia area. That will greatly help the situation as it stands right now.

The Wilmington Veterans' Hospital, which has rendered the most efficient, the most expedient, and the most cooperative care for our veterans and the veterans of Delaware, Maryland, and all of south Jersey, are now operating at over and above standard capacity for the type of facility that they have there. Due to the increase and the soaring amount of veterans requiring hospitalization for both general medical and general surgical care the veterans' hospital at Wilmington has now a long waiting surgical list.

I personally feel that the Veterans' Administration are guilty of fooling the people, veterans, and veterans organizations to this extent: They have almost continually adopted the policy of economy measures in spite of the fact that they have had an appropriation for the fiscal year of 1952 which would ordinarily have been sufficient for operations for the balance of fiscal year 1952. However, it has been reported to all our department headquarters that Veterans' Administration, themselves, in recent months returned part of the allocated funds to the Federal Government. Yet, all the time they knew they required not only more funds to continue operations but they would require additional funds to hire additional personnel to meet the rising needs and cost of the medical out-patient-treatment program and to meet the rising necessities of many new veterans.

I believe it is high time that we have some congressional investigation into this VA medical program; we should have an investigation to find out why we do not have sufficient funds for the VA medical program, present and proposed; we should have an investigation as to why there are no funds available periodically to continue with the OPT program, both dental and medical; we should find out why the Veterans' Administration are not allocated sufficient funds to carry out this program, and we should then find out why the VA returned some of the funds back to the Federal Government.

In view of the above I would request that you take immediate congressional action and contact your colleagues in the House of Representatives and also the members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, to look into this matter further and under official status. I would also recommend that either yourself or a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee contact Gen. Carl Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and also Admiral Boone, Medical Chief, Veterans' Administration, to see what they actually have to say about the hospital bed facilities in this area, and what they propose to do about it. Thus far, we have only had some very

poor excuses regarding the shortages of hospital bed facilities. For example, in a communication, of which you have the original copy, the VA said that it is a phasing-out program inasmuch as a new hospital was being built and was going to be opened at Philadelphia. However, they do not state how great the veteran patient load is in the Philadelphia area and our own particular area, nor do they state how they expect the new hospital and its limited facilities to carry this very great and ever-increasing patient load. The Veterans' Administration has not stated yet, to anyone to the best of my knowledge, why they are so short of funds for the entire medical program of the Veterans' Administration. Also being hard hit is the Veterans' Administration medical outpatient treatment program. For example, periodically veterans with service-connected tooth disabilities who require repairs or replacement of bridge, plates, or complete dentures, undergo an appraisal examination at local VA facilities, and are then told that they will get their teeth, repairs, etc., as soon as funds become available. That not only is detrimental to the veteran and his particular dental disability and requirements but it is in conflict with congressional law. The Veterans' Administration should by this time have enough experience to be able to state in their proposed budgets and their requests for emergency appropriations about how much money it will take to render this service to veterans with service-connected dental needs.

The VA medical outpatient treatment program is being hard hit periodically for the same reason. Many disabled veterans with service-connected disabilities who require about 4 to 8 treatments by their own private physicians per month are periodically finding themselves confronted with a letter stating, "Based upon all the evidence on record, it has been determined that your need for outpatient treatment no longer requires 4 visits to your physician per month; therefore, you are authorized to report to your own chosen physician twice per month." Of course, in many cases the Veterans' Administration is justified in cutting down the outpatient treatment program for certain disabled veterans; however, in many cases they are not justified, but I feel that the VA must cut down, inasmuch as they do not have sufficient funds to carry on the VA outpatient medical program as intended by congressional law.

Mr. HAND, these are not charges that I make, they are only instances in which I ask you, as my congressional Representative, to check into, not only with the Veterans' Administration, but to ask the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to look into this matter also, inasmuch as this condition may become worse rather than better.

Yours very sincerely,

ANTHONY J. VOLPE,
County Service Officer.

I was glad recently to give Mr. Volpe the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee that a special subcommittee on this hospital problem would be appointed in the near future to make a complete review of the entire situation.

It is not practical to attempt to correct this picture in the pending supplemental appropriations bill, but prompt attention should be given it, first, by the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and then by the Appropriations Committee for the new fiscal year.

We owe an obligation to our veterans which we can and must fulfill.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday we spent a lot of time talking about chairs. We had a lot of fun talking about round-back chairs, long-back chairs, and then the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who I always enjoy listening to, got into a discussion about Old House Office Building livestock, and we had a lot of fun with that. We spent considerable time, in fact, so much time that we did not get as far as we thought we would with the bill yesterday. I think it is worthwhile spending a little time discussing veterans' beds. Now, I am not going to burden you with a lot of statistics. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has covered the field adequately.

I want to speak to you on behalf of myself and my colleagues from Philadelphia [Messrs. BARRETT, BYRNE of Pennsylvania, GRANAHAN, and GREEN].

We have a very unique and practical problem in Philadelphia in connection with hospital beds. When they built the Philadelphia Veterans' Hospital, and a formula was worked out by the Veterans' Administration in an administrative capacity whereby they were going to phase out 400 beds in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital. We knew last October it was not going to work. The American Legion had a protest meeting in November. We contacted the Veterans' Administration and they gave us a 3-page single-spaced letter telling us how it was going to work.

Then this January the Philadelphia Veterans' Hospital opened. It would have been wonderful if they could have taken in 400 or 500 patients on the 1st of January, but the day it opened they took in 4 patients. They explained that by the fact that it takes time to indoctrinate personnel, it takes time to teach personnel how to operate the hospital, and it would be months before they would be able to fill that hospital with patients to its full capacity. In the meantime the naval hospital would not take in any more patients.

Illness does not wait. We found that in Philadelphia requests for hospitalization by worthy veterans were mounting day by day. I found when I got back to Philadelphia over the weekend 4, 5, or 6 families of veterans in my office begging for hospitalization. I spent all my time running all over making telephone calls to Lebanon, Pa., to Wilmington, Del., and to Richmond, Va., trying to get veterans into the hospitals. We were able to get some of them in the other hospitals, but when we got a veteran from Philadelphia into a Richmond hospital it meant that a veteran from the Richmond area had a bed taken up and he could not get into the Richmond hospital.

Then we ran into this situation. I should like to mention one specific case, that of a veteran with four children. He suffered from cancer. He had to have immediate hospitalization. We finally found a spot for him in Wilmington. Wilmington has been very cooperative. The question came up of how we were going to get the veteran to Wilmington. The family did not have the money, and they did not want him to go in an ambu-

lance because, even though the American Legion had volunteered to let us have an ambulance, they did not want him to know how sick he was. He finally went to Wilmington, but the family could not visit him because of lack of funds for transportation. I think the doctors in this House will agree that when a man is sick one of the comforting things, especially when he is in his last illness, is a visit from his family. They had him in Wilmington for a while and could not keep him there any longer, so they sent him up to the Bronx, in New York, a hundred miles from Philadelphia. His family still could not visit him.

That is what we have every day. We are running into a practical problem, where we have sick veterans and we cannot send them anywhere because the veterans' hospital in Philadelphia is not fully open and will not be for 6 months, and the naval hospital will not take them in because of the phasing-out program.

I want to say something to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. He is trying to convince us that we can legislate by committee report. I have been on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I was a member of the special Teague committee in the last session. I know when we got into our investigations—and the gentleman from Texas will agree with me—we found that we gave too much administrative power to the Veterans' Administration. We found that they abused that power. We found that abuses grew up in the Veterans' Administration, in the GI school program, and in the housing program, as a result of faulty administration. That is why I come here today asking you to spell out in our legislation the \$729,000 we need in Philadelphia to keep our veterans in hospitals.

It is all right for a Congressman, if he does not like a high-back chair or a low-back chair, to sit on the floor, but a veteran cannot possibly wait outside a hospital when he needs treatment.

I think this is a fair request. It is only to the end of this fiscal year. I think if we get over this fiscal year with this money our Philadelphia problem will be solved by future legislation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make an effort to see how long we should continue this discussion. I suggest 10 minutes, the time to be divided between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I know that all the Pennsylvania delegation are very much interested in having this problem solved. I do not think that ought to be cut down to 10 minutes, when it is really an important question.

Mr. PHILLIPS. How much time does the gentleman from Pennsylvania want?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would want 2 minutes anyhow.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman will get 2½ minutes, as it is.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending

amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. TEAGUE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, of course this matter has been brought before the House in the way it has been because of discrimination against Pennsylvania. Any person can look at the services rendered to veterans throughout the country and they will immediately conclude without any possibility of doubt that Pennsylvania has been discriminated against. I agree with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF] has said that it is the fault of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. If we do not correct it in this instance and in this manner, he is going to keep on acting as he has been acting for quite some time, and that is in a dictatorial manner. You put the intention of Congress in a report, and he will come back with some such answer as: "Well, it is not practical to do it that way."

They have been beating around the bush and will never come to an agreement with the Navy. Are we going to wait until there is an agreement between the Navy and the Veterans' Administration? It may be 9 months from now. The regular appropriation bill will probably not become a law until next July or August, or perhaps even September. Are we going to let these veterans stand out on the street and not get proper hospital treatment? This situation must be handled by the adoption of this amendment; or else this Congress may be accused by all Pennsylvania veterans that they are being discriminated against. I urge the members of this committee to support the amendment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I concur in what the gentleman says. This amendment has no bearing on the Teague amendment. The gentleman from Texas said we should vote the amendment down. It has no bearing whatsoever on the Teague amendment. A very desperate situation exists in Philadelphia, and this is an emergency provision to take care of a very critical hospitalization problem in Philadelphia.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is the only practical way for us to handle it because if we let this go on, it will be handled in a dictatorial manner by the Veterans' Administrator. I say that from experience too. He makes whatever decision he wants, regardless of what is in the bill, and regardless also of what is in the report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. With all due respect to the committee, and with all due respect to the report of the committee, I would point out that the committee report does not have a binding effect upon the Administrator. There is no definite assurance that the situation will be adjusted, and everyone—even the members of the committee agrees that a situation exists in Philadelphia which requires action. The only way to guarantee such action is by the adoption of the amendment. The committee report itself, no matter how well meaning it may be, and no matter how well intentioned it may be, is not going to accomplish that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Referring to that, I say the amendment will help the State of New York and the State of New Jersey and the State of Ohio and various other States as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

(Mr. COTTON asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, let us understand one thing quite clearly. Your Subcommittee on Independent Offices agreed thoroughly with our friends from Philadelphia in their perfectly commendable desire to see to it that sufficient and proper care was given to the veterans of that area. When the time came to act, we had this confronting us; firstly, undoubtedly the entire \$5 million requested by the Veterans' Administration on this item would have been reduced somewhat by our committee because it was not entirely justified by the evidence, in our opinion. But we said, "Let us give them every cent so that there will be no question but that the Philadelphia area will be taken care of." So you see, we left money in the bill for that purpose.

Secondly, we were confronted with the proposition that this figure of \$759,000 was an arbitrary figure that somebody in the Veterans' Administration gave to some Representative from Pennsylvania as the money necessary to care for 400 more beds, when, as a matter of fact, by use of the naval hospital that money was much more than was necessary. Therefore, we are convinced it will be a perfectly simple matter to take care of these cases, out of the \$5 million.

Thirdly, we put in the report—and have no fear the Veterans' Administration understand what we mean—that they must take care of the situation and take care of it adequately without putting the Congress in the position of saying, "You shall furnish so many beds here and so many beds there."

In answer to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I would refer him to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], who has been the able chairman of our subcommittee for years, when he suggested—and we all agreed—that not next year or next month, but next week, if there is any question about the situation in Philadelphia being taken care of, we on the Independent Offices

Subcommittee pledge you that we shall have the Veterans' Administration down here, and I think, in view of the fact that we are going to pass on their regular budget soon, we can get action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, of course all of us love the city of brotherly love. I would not deprive them of needed hospital facilities for their honorably discharged veterans. But I am sure I do not necessarily have to dwell upon the fact that there is hardly a State or a city or a town or hamlet in the entire country in which some hospital facilities are not now badly needed for service-connected veterans.

During the period between the election and the meeting of this session of the Congress I did some personal work myself, being impressed by the number of telephone calls and telegrams I received, making it imperative to exert political influence to get veterans into a veterans' hospital. I am told that in my State there are less beds per capita than any other community in the United States. It is a deplorable fact.

How better could we invest our time than to thrash out this important matter? We are scarce of money. Last year we provided money for the erection of these hospital beds, but the then President froze that money. It is a deplorable thing to call upon a youth to leave his fireside, with his father probably about my age—because veterans of World War I are now about 60 years old—leave his father in bed in a poorly provided home with inadequate funds, probably with an honorable discharge from the Army, service connected or otherwise, and take that man away to fight another police action, sometimes referred to as war. How can he be a brave soldier when he knows that his father, who fought for the same country, is at home in need of adequate medical and hospital facilities? I hope that necessary legislation will be enacted without further delay to take care of these needy veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 62, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE: Page 10, line 11, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$20,000,000."

[Mr. TEAGUE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, this is the problem which I stated a moment ago was too great and too lengthy to discuss on the floor of the House. I think it belongs for preliminary discussion in the committee of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Two days ago the Veterans' Administration had in its fund for dental care the sum of \$5,158,680. The gentleman from Michigan has told you of the manipulation of interpretation of the law by which a tooth filled in the service at one time thereafter becomes itself service-connected, although the adjoining teeth are not service-connected.

The matter of whether or not some of these Korean veterans should be in hospitals is a matter very close to the heart of every Member of the Congress, but has to do with the interpretation of the law and not the amount of money. We gave them last year every bit of money that was asked for. We gave them all the money that was asked for this year. If you will look at the records of the committee, you will find that the money taken out of the bill was not taken out of this fund, but was taken out of the request for additional employees that were asked for by the Veterans' Administration in services having nothing to do with domiciliary or hospital care.

Day before yesterday there was still \$2,105,895 in the fund for hospitals, and we have added to that \$5 million for the remainder of this year. What the gentleman from Texas is doing, in fact, is not putting back in money we took out. The amendment has nothing to do with the figure \$18,000,000, the original request. It is in effect making the original request \$28 million, and that opens the entire problem that should be considered by this Congress at the earliest possible moment as to what constitutes service connection and just how far we are going to go with the hospitalization of veterans; whether or not they have serious injuries; how far we are going to go with veterans who actually have no service-connected disability. There are at this moment on the records of the Veterans' Administration only 70 veterans in the entire United States with service connection who are not in hospitals, and of that 70 a certain proportion of them are out of the hospitals by their own desire because they want to go at a later date, or something like that. A determination must be made not on this point I am making. On what constitutes service connection, it is my opinion that there is a much larger number of service-connected cases than on the Veterans' Administration roll, but that still does not make the total 120,000, which is the present number of activated beds. I ask you to look at the chart of the actual number of cases presently in the veterans' hospitals where you have 131,000 authorized and 120,000 activated beds and observe the number of cases which will be on the rolls if we continue the present interpretation of the law, without the addition of the Korean veterans, with whom the gentle-

man from Mississippi and the gentleman from Texas and I am very seriously concerned with. The number of cases which will be required in one generation will be over 325,000 cases without any change. We would more than double the number of beds. Are we going to back into socialized medicine by the back door when we deny it by the front door? Are we going to limit the care which the United States gives to its veterans, its utmost deserving veterans, that this country has always given care to and has never denied anything to? Should that determination be made at this moment on the floor of the House or by the proper committee in Congress giving careful consideration to the whole problem of service connection, because that is the problem that we have before us today? I hope that you will vote against this amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to what the gentleman from California has said. I am for economy as much as anybody in this House but I am not for economy at the expense of the halt and the lame and the feeble veteran. The gentleman from California said we should wait; we should tarry. Well, I am reminded of the adage, "on the plains of hesitation lie countless bones of millions," and I do not want to wait. I am not going to allow anybody, without protest, to minimize the complaints that have been offered to many of us in the metropolitan areas by veterans' associations. They tell us beyond the peradventure of a doubt that there is woeful inadequacy of administration, medical, hospital and domiciliary services. That is why I rise to support this increase of \$10 million for those services. Those men whom we seek to help have risked their all. Many have just escaped by a hair's breadth going through the valley of the shadow. We Members of Congress have no trouble getting similar services. We could go to Bethesda Hospital; we can go to the Walter Reed Hospital. There are plenty of beds for us at slight cost to take care of our needs when we become ill. What are we going to say to the veteran when he pleads for a bed? What are you going to say to the long queue of veterans in my area who cannot get these medical and surgical and dental services when Members of the House and Members of the other body can very readily, without let or hindrance, go into these institutions here in the city of Washington and get their medical, surgical needs satisfied. What are our explanations then to the needy veteran. I for one, therefore, say that a veteran should not be compelled to wait. When injured and hurt or harmed he is speedily entitled to the proper comfort and the proper care. I say to the gentleman from California that illness does not wait, the virus does not tarry. We should not delay. Wounds do not heal without treatment. Treatment is useless without beds, and beds are useless without nurses and doctors and medicines and all those facilities that the veterans, particularly up in my city of New York,

lack and are demanding. We must answer that demand.

This amendment does not say that this or that State shall get so much of the additional \$10 million. We leave that to the discretionary power of the head of the Veterans' Administration. He is not going to waste the money. I am sure you can trust him by appropriating \$20 million instead of \$10 million for this type of service.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this is an old subject to all of us and it has been said many times from this very spot where I am now standing. No man can claim a monopoly on his desire to help the sick veterans. There is not a man on this floor that will not do everything necessary to be done for them in that regard, whether the illness is service-connected or not. Someone raised that question.

What are the facts here, Mr. Chairman? We all talk about the fact we are going to do this and we are going to do that. The President has sent to us a budget estimate for hospitals in the sum of \$5 million. Now, do not be misled by that heading. Under that heading you put this additional \$10 million. Let me digress there. That will cover anything from A to Z besides hospitals, warehouses, finance, anything you have. When you throw it in there as a lump sum, as you are putting it in there now, there is no assurance that hospitals will get one extra nickel, and I am telling you the absolute truth. The President sent up a budget estimate for hospitals for how much? Five million dollars, and that \$5 million is in the bill. Not 1 penny was deducted. Could your committee do more? We cannot help it because the great general, General Gray, never stays in his office more than 2 days a week. The peripatetic general ought to stay in his office a little bit and learn something about his job, and he would not have to enter into a conspiracy with his own staff and employees to turn the heater on and loose the wolves on the Members regardless of which side of the aisle they sat on saying, "All right, now is the time, boys. The election is on November 4. Get after them in October." It was not your intention then, and it is not your intention now, to deny these veterans the hospitalization which they need. Let us be frank about it. Let us not kid ourselves. All that this committee has said in the past, and all we say now is, "You get in there and use your funds wisely. Do not come here and ask our committee for 428 more contact men when you already have about 1,600 contact employees. Take that money and put it in benefits and in hospitalization for veterans." We say, "General Gray spend that money as it ought to be spent." We say to him, "You have not done it. You have done a poor job and you know it." I have seen it with my own eyes—I have seen hospital after hospital with fine furnishings. The staff is there, the medicine is there and everything is there except the veteran in the bed. The bed is vacant. We told him, "Don't you fire a single doctor or a single nurse or a

single dietitian." He did not, but through his poor management, keeping the contact boys and keeping the political machine going, he lets the veterans' beds remain vacant. He dug up \$600,000 to pay for the Booz, Allen & Hamilton report to reorganize the Veterans' Administration. This Congress did not authorize him to spend one red cent of that \$600,000. Where did he get it? Mr. Chairman, he could have opened up a tremendous number of hospital beds with that \$600,000. It was a political move on his part to save his own hide, and I hope President Eisenhower gets a good man to take care of the veterans because General Gray has done a very poor job.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object, unless I can have at least 5 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] for one minute and a quarter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I understood that only those Members who were standing would have the time divided among them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Members among whom the time has been divided were standing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Were they standing, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. All were standing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of this House for a long time. Only a few have been here longer. I have engaged in the debate of tremendously important issues—issues that have changed our history and reshaped our destiny. As the chairman of the great Committee on Veterans' Affairs, it seems to me unfair, even shocking, that there cannot be given to me enough time to make a brief statement relating to this matter of increased appropriations so greatly needed for the care and hospitalization of our veterans. To deny this time is quite significant that when it comes to matters concerning our veterans, who are greatly increasing in numbers every day, there is a marked effort on the part of some to turn away from their needs, their requirements, their well-earned care for the sake of economy. Just remember this: if you are going to continue to send boys into the fires of war, you must care for their shattered bodies and spirits. You cannot compromise heroism for freedom on the shifting sands of political advantage based on economy.

Is it the objective to deny those of us fighting for justice and fair treatment

of the veterans a chance to make a case? I have asked for a rule for my resolution which authorizes members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to make investigations of veterans' facilities for the purpose of improvement in the efficient operation and care of our veterans. For over a month this resolution has been before the Committee on Rules. To date, they have failed to grant a rule. Give us our rule. Give us a chance to make a case. At this time other committees have inspectors investigating veterans' facilities. Why is it this right has not been given to the very committee organized and designed to function for this very purpose? Is this considered efficiency of the legislative function? If it is, then I disagree, and I think the American people, the American mothers and wives should know all that is taking place. The Veterans' Committee is not created for the purpose of doing nothing. This committee is created to help the men and women who have fought for America, for freedom, for you and every American. You should help it to do its job, and gladly so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire. One thing the Members do not realize, and that is that men who have a service-connected disability who are awaiting hospitalization may be hospitalized for non-service-connected disability, and because of this interim non-service-connected disability are carried as non-service-connected cases.

I would like also to point out that the Army and the Navy have patients in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. This of course takes beds away from veterans in need of hospitalization. It is passing strange that the Army and Navy have no difficulty in getting their appropriations for their hospitals. They have no difficulty in getting doctors. In fact, they take doctors away from the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman very much. This is a serious problem. I know the gentleman completely realizes its importance. I think the Members do not realize we have an increasing load of Korean veterans all the time. The Korean war has caused more injuries and more deaths than was anticipated. We have an increasing load because of legislation we passed for presumptively connected NP cases and TB cases during the last session of Congress, and we will probably have within a short time more cases presumptively connected. Last

year the Congress cut appropriations for veterans \$31 million. Surely some Members did not comprehend how seriously this cut would affect the care of veterans, particularly in view of the increasing numbers of Korean veterans requiring care and hospitalization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

(Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect and admiration for our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and I fully realize his lack of confidence in General Gray. But this additional money is not for General Gray but for the relief of our ex-fighting men. Regardless of what kind of an administrator General Gray is, we still have veterans who are in dire need of hospitalization. I am not talking just about Tennessee, either; I am talking about veterans all over this country.

Men with service-connected cases, many of them critically ill, who need to get into hospitals now, regardless of how General Gray has administered the Veterans' Administration. If he is guilty of mal or misadministration let us get someone in there who will carry out the wishes of this Congress and take care of our veterans, the defenders of our Nation. Personally I think we are doing this country a grave injustice when we neglect the men who protected our great Nation in times of peril and war.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, when the cuts in VA medical availabilities were made last year there was great protest by the veterans' organizations. We have a chance to correct it now. Let us do it fully. It is almost impossible for the Member who has not participated in the detail of this question, to get to the basic facts here, and you pretty well have to pin your faith on the conclusions from the facts arrived at by those Members who have studied the situation in detail. Our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], has made a colorful appeal, and, as he generally does, is a lion in favor of what his own subcommittee decided and he carries the ball very well, indeed.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is the author of the Teague bill, the Korean GI bill of rights. It was not a wild bill; it was a very conservative one, soundly conceived and carefully worked out after extensive hearings and study. It received overwhelming support in the House. Today I shall follow the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who, I think, is looking at this from the veterans' point of view and has stated the question very fairly and forcibly. To carry out the veterans' hospitalization program we need, according to Mr. TEAGUE's

findings this additional \$10 million. We have cut \$1,200,000,000 requested in this deficiency appropriation for defense. Let us then, even if we should err on the side of generosity, appropriate \$10 million more to veterans' hospitalization—for the men who make defense possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] is recognized.

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, the Legislature of California does not agree with my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. Under date of January 14, 1953, resolution to provide more adequately for the care of veterans in California was adopted by the State legislature. It was introduced, as the distinguished gentleman from California is undoubtedly aware, by 8 gentlemen with whom he is undoubtedly acquainted—8 Republican senators long known for their anxious participation in all economy moves in California Legislature. They are not spendthrifts, they do not want any department or branch of government to needlessly expend the taxpayers' money. But, in my State we have a serious problem in providing hospitalization and hometown medical care for our veteran population.

My State has made heavy contributions to the welfare of the veterans within its boundaries—many of them in no way a proper charge upon California government. We have been generous with them, because in our moment of need they were generous to us.

Four thousand six hundred veterans are in our State mental institutions. Of this number 1,500 have clear right to Federal hospitalization as the result of service-connected disabilities. In our county hospitals throughout California, hospitals supported by a direct levy of tax upon the homeowners of my State, we find in every county men receiving care because the Federal Government has failed to adequately provide for its responsibilities.

In fact, gentlemen, the Federal Government is chiseling upon the resources of my State, playing upon the natural sympathies and sense of obligation of many citizens to provide that which past Congresses have failed to provide.

I am surprised that Congressman PHILLIPS should take this floor to protest amending this bill to meet a clearly defined, easily recognized need. If this is a sense of the thing we must do to achieve economy, if only by forsaking responsibility, are we to be enabled to save the dollars, then I must decline to participate in bringing about that saving. It is my studied opinion that we can save many millions—yes; even billions of dollars, in the operation of our Federal Government. I do not propose, however, as has been suggested in this piece of legislation, to start any savings, first at the expense of the youngsters in our public schools, and secondly at the expense of the veterans who have made our freedom possible.

The four able commanders of nationally recognized veterans' organizations

in my State recently, under date of December 22, 1952, presented a joint statement to the Governor of my State, that distinguished Republican gentleman, Earl Warren. These outstanding veteran leaders are Mr. William A. White, commander, American Legion of California; Mr. Walter Keil, commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars of California; Mr. E. L. Johnson, commander, Disabled American Veterans of California; and Mr. Edward A. Miratti, commander, AMVETS, State of California.

In that petition they recited some most revealing information. But, let me read some of their statistical data to the Members of this House:

It is a well known fact that many hundreds of thousands of veterans have been migrating to California from every other State in the Union since the close of World War I. It is not, however, such a well known fact that an unusually large percentage of these veterans are disabled. Veterans Administration records will show that California has a higher percentage of veterans drawing compensation or pension than any other State in the Union.

(a) Of the Nation's 20,000,000 veteran population, it is reliably estimated that California has approximately 1,750,000 or approximately 9 percent.

(b) Of the Nation's 80,000, 100 percent service-connected totally and permanently disabled World War II veterans, California has 10,400, or 13 percent.

(c) California has the highest number—38,500—service-connected World War I veterans; New York is second, with 32,250.

(d) California has the highest number—5,750—service-connected veterans from the Regular Establishment (peacetime veterans); New York is second, with 2,500.

(e) California has the highest number—13,500—Spanish-American War veterans drawing compensation or pension; New York is second, with 8,000.

While there continues to be a curtailment in the number of hospital beds for veterans in California, the number of applications for hospitalization continues to show a steady increase.

The number of veteran case folders transferred into California Veterans' Administration offices as compared with those transferred out, shows that approximately 1,200 veterans per month among this group have taken permanent residence in California.

It is clearly indicated therefore, from actual facts and figures that regardless of the Veterans' Administration's estimate of our State's veteran population, that California must have a higher ratio of hospital beds per veteran population than any State in the Union because of the higher percentage of disabilities.

Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary beds in California are not for the exclusive use of California veterans. Many of these beds are occupied by out-of-State veterans, for various reasons, such as follows:

(a) The Veterans' Administration tumor clinic for the western part of the United States, is in Los Angeles—Wadsworth General Hospital, Veterans' Administration Center.

(b) Their paraplegic center for the western part of the United States is at Long Beach.

(c) Their neuropsychiatric patients from Arizona, Nevada, and other western

States, for the most part are hospitalized in California.

(d) Their diagnostic center for the western part of the United States is in San Francisco—Fort Miley.

(e) The rather high percentage of domiciliary members at their domiciliary home at Los Angeles are out-of-State veterans.

The curtailment of hospital beds for veterans in California began in June 1949 with the cancellation of 100 contract beds for veterans at the Army's McCormack General Hospital at Pasadena, and has continued ever since.

As of June 1949, hospital beds in operation for veterans in California were as follows:

| | |
|--|--------|
| Veterans' Administration hospitals... | 11,745 |
| Veterans' Administration contract beds with service hospitals..... | 1,650 |
| Grand total..... | 13,395 |

As of December 15, 1952, hospital beds in operation for veterans in California are as follows:

| | |
|---|--------|
| Veterans' Administration hospitals... | 11,220 |
| Veterans' Administration beds with service hospitals..... | 175 |
| Grand total..... | 11,395 |

For a quick glance:

| | |
|---|--------|
| Total number of operating available beds as of June 1949..... | 13,395 |
| Total number of operating available beds as of Dec. 15, 1953..... | 11,395 |

This is a 2,000-bed net reduction. According to Veterans' Administration records of patient turnover, it is reliably estimated that 3,000 veterans per month are being denied hospitalization because of this cutback.

I could go on and recite so many facts—facts which should be known by every member of the California delegation regardless of the side of the House in which he sits to perform his duties, but I believe I have said sufficient, although at this point I want to bring in one other authority.

The California Medical Association under date of January 21, 1953, in a letter addressed to me, urged that every consideration by the Congress be given to providing adequately for the veterans of the wars of the United States. I think the most revealing statement in that letter is this brief portion of text referring to the cuts forced upon the Veterans' Administration by the 82d Congress:

The result of this is that some veterans are receiving their needed care in part as a charity from their own physicians, some are paying the difference in charges from their own funds, and some are receiving less care than their own physicians believe they should have.

Are we, Mr. Chairman, to continue to permit our veterans to receive less care?

I say, "no." It is our obligation to see that they receive adequate care in every sense of the word, just as we expected them to give adequate service when we charged them with the responsibility of defending this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my remarks by correcting an impression which my esteemed colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] apparently labored under, that this amount of money, this additional \$10 million which is being provided in the Teague amendment, is not earmarked in any fashion, that it is simply a general allocation. If I understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] correctly in his interpretation of the amendment it is specifically stated that it is provided for "Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary service."

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. This \$10 million is put in just exactly like my good friend from Texas pointed out in regard to the other \$5 million. He said the report spells it out. This debate on the floor spells out my \$10 million.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. Did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] have a comment he wished to make?

Mr. THOMAS. I just want to state that the \$5 million is nailed down in the report in the appropriate language. As it now stands the money can be used for a hundred different things other than hospitalization.

Mr. EDMONDSON. There seems to be a difference of opinion on that between the two gentlemen from Texas. I think what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has to say as ranking minority member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee should have great weight.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman from Texas says it is nailed down in the report. In previous appropriations they were nailed down in reports, too; but they were not nailed down in the legislation and specifically spelled out, and that is why Philadelphia is having such a desperate time in finding hospitalization for the veterans of Pennsylvania; so it ought to be specifically and definitely nailed down in the legislation and not the report.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, we have in Oklahoma two hospitals to handle veterans' problems. One of them is located in Muskogee, in my district. That hospital, intended to be a 380-bed hospital, is operating now with 320 beds. We are operating with personnel reduced from a ceiling which we had back in 1947 of 484 people, with only 415 today, a substantial reduction in personnel, even though our State has had a great increase in veteran population, probably greater than most of the States in this Nation, due to the participation of the 45th Division in Korea.

The need for this amendment seems to be obvious and certainly it can be supported in good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the discussion we have had today and on this amendment leads directly to the door of that alleged collective-security agency known as the United Nations. If our so-called free world friends in the United Nations had done their share of turning the crank on the human meat grinder in Korea, we would not today be calling on American taxpayers to spend so much money for the hospitalization of American veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to support the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and to commend him for the thorough study that he made in this matter.

I had this situation brought to my attention in my own district last fall when General Gray and some of his axe men came into my district and cut out a hospital. I wrote to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to get details and did. I want to thank him for those details. I checked into the figures and I want to tell you now that the best thing that can be done for the veterans is to get a new head of the Veterans' Administration whom we can trust.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, although I am just a freshman member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I wish to express my opinions on this vital legislation and offer my support to the amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. During the past several weeks the members of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs have heard the testimony of General Gray, Admiral Boone, and other members of the staff of the Veterans' Administration. I have been very much impressed with their testimony. It is my opinion that General Gray has done an excellent job and that the problems we now have are not because of the adjudication on the part of the Veterans' Administration, but it is because of the language of the legislation which was passed by Congress. These laws promised certain benefits for the veterans which have not been available because not enough money was appropriated.

There is no question about the need of these hospital beds. In my own district, the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, we desperately need more beds and the modernization of our veterans' facility at Lake City, and we need a new hospital for the treatment of our neuropsychiatric veterans. One million dollars has already been spent to, obtain the land and to draw the plans for such a facility at Gainesville. We have heard here on the floor of the House the testimony of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, New York, South Carolina, and many other States.

The purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas is to try to take care of just a small part of this need by making a limited number of funds available for the hospital benefits of veterans which were promised by the Congress. I believe General Gray is sincere when he asked for this extra money to carry out on a very minimum basis the hospital services to veterans that have been promised them by existing laws, and I believe we ought to support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I was a patient in the Veterans' Hospital at Jackson, Miss., when the 10 percent medical cutback order came about. Regardless of what the subcommittee or General Gray might say, about its effect on hospital and medical services for the veteran, I can personally attest to the fact that it was the veteran who got hurt in the deal. Following the cutback, I saw ward attendants in that hospital work around-the-clock in order to see that the patients received proper and necessary treatment and care, because there were not enough attendants available for regular shifts.

Congress provided that the service-connected veteran "shall" receive treatment for service-connected disabilities. The law's promise to the veteran implies that the services will be available. Today the VA is turning down boys who have service-connected injuries, and the Congress is breaking faith with our veterans if we do not restore enough funds to give those boys the treatment they are entitled to.

The VA has exhausted all available funds for providing dental treatment for service-connected cases, and actually has a waiting list at most facilities. Some of these waiting lists are more than 3 months old, so critical is the situation.

It is true that some rating boards might have abused their authority in granting service connection in some cases, as was suggested a while ago by one of the opposition speakers to this amendment. Is that sufficient justification for denying relief to the deserving cases? I do not believe there is a person here who would advocate the denial of treatment to service-connected disabled veterans. But that is what you will do if you defeat this amendment.

I, for one, am not so much concerned over the cases receiving service connection wrongly as I am for those thousands of deserving veterans who suffered injuries in line of duty but are denied service connection.

My record will attest to my support of economy. I believe in cutting out all of our unnecessary expenditures, but, believe me when I say that the funds provided in the Teague amendment are absolutely essential. Economy—yes. But economize by cutting nonessential expenditures. The health and well-being of thousands of ex-servicemen depend on the outcome of the vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 84, noes 87.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. TEAGUE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 118, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

(Mr. MATTHEWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

"Military personnel requirements," Department of the Air Force, \$115 million; the foregoing amounts under this heading to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation during the fiscal year 1953 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YORTY: On page 12, line 17, after the word "Budget", insert a new sentence as follows: "Before approving any such transfer, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall first determine that such transfer will not result in a deficiency requiring restoration of any of the amount transferred to the appropriation from which the transfer is approved."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment so that I may have an opportunity to study the language of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the gentleman from Massachusetts will want to press his point of order, when I have explained the purpose of the amendment. As I view it, it does not really change the purport of the appropriation at all. It merely spells out what the committee has explained to us they were trying to do in arranging that these funds be transferred from appropriations where they are not needed and used to cover the \$1,200,000,000 that this bill would otherwise have to appropriate. I want to compliment the committee on this ingenious method of saving money. If they can actually find surplus funds and use them to cover the deficiency that this bill would otherwise have to cover, they have indeed made a very substantial saving in the budget for this fiscal year. In this case we are talking of a substantial amount—\$1,200,000,000. It is certainly worth saving if we can do it. The committee has done a fine job here in pointing out where they think the funds can be found without further appropriation. I hope they are right. I just want to make sure that the intent of this Congress in permitting this transfer is spelled out in the law and not merely commented upon in a report—exactly the subject we were discussing a few

minutes ago. The report explains that it is intended that funds which are not needed in other places shall be used to cover this deficiency. I think that is fine. But I do not think such funds should be used if we are going to be asked to turn right around and put them back again by new appropriations on the ground that we borrowed from funds that were needed. So I am simply providing that before the Director of the Bureau of the Budget approves any transfers from other appropriations to cover this deficiency, he shall first find that we will not be asked to restore those funds to the appropriations from which they are to be taken. Now that is a very simple proposition, and if I understood the committee correctly that is exactly what they intended. They did not intend to come here and fool themselves and fool us by simply juggling funds. They intended to try to squeeze a little water out of the Defense Department budget; if there is any water in it which can be found, and use the funds so made available to cover this deficiency. I want to make it crystal clear that I am not criticising anybody on the Committee on Appropriations or indicating that there is water or padding in the defense budget through any fault of theirs. We all know and we all keep charging that there is waste in the Defense Establishment, but we all know that when you are handling as large an organization as the Defense Establishment, and spending the amount of money that they are spending, there is bound to be some waste no matter how efficient they may try to be. In the different places in the world where I have seen military establishments in operation, I have seen some very conscientious military commanders doing their very best to hold costs down. I think we ought to give them credit once in a while instead of picking out just the ones who are wasteful and talking always about them.

Military operations are, in their essence, to some extent wasteful. I do not say that because the funds may be found in other appropriations and used for this deficiency that this necessarily means that they should not have been appropriated originally. It may as well mean that some conscientious commander has found a means of getting along with less than he originally anticipated, and the savings are available to make up this deficiency.

Now, if the committee means what it says, if it intends that this deficiency shall be made up out of a saving and not merely out of a juggling of figures to fool ourselves into thinking we have made a saving when we have not, they should support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and imposes new duties on the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. YORTY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am simply spelling out one of the conditions under which the transfer of funds is to be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. This appropriation bill already legislates, in that it requires the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I am simply saying that he find a condition precedent before he approves that transfer. I do not think the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALLEN of Illinois). The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair the amendment contains legislation, contrary to the rules of the House.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that some comment should be made on some of the statements of the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY]. I am in sympathy with the purpose of his amendment but I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] that it is subject to a point of order.

I think we should get this so-called saving of \$1,200,000,000 into proper focus: I do not believe anyone has said that this bill saves \$1,200,000,000 in the military program. Briefly, here is the situation: At the end of the last fiscal year—that is, June 30, 1952—the Department of Defense had on hand in unexpended funds about \$59 billion. On June 30 of this year the Department of Defense will have on hand about \$61 billion in unexpended funds. Of course, those large sums are principally for the procurement of major, long-time lead items, such as guided missiles, airplanes, ships, and things like that. Since the budget was prepared last year we have had a steel strike. Also, the Bureau of the Budget withheld from the services in the Department of Defense for several months certain funds which had been appropriated by the Congress. It is evident at this time, and the officials in the Department of Defense admit, that all of the funds which we appropriated will not be required. Several factors enter into the picture. Some of these sums will represent postponements.

There are some savings but we cannot estimate how much at this time. If it develops that adequate savings cannot be made and that postponements will hinder the defense program materially, there will be plenty of time to appropriate the funds later—the fiscal year does not end until June 30, 4 months hence. In an effort to accomplish every possible economy, and in view of the readjustment of funds which has taken place and programs which have been changed, it does seem now that these funds, \$1,200,000,000, can be allocated from other funds without too serious injury to the military program. It is in that spirit and on that basis that I went along with the committee on this \$1,200,000,000 item, and I think that somewhat represents the viewpoint of other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YORTY. As the gentleman from Texas commented about the saving, I notice that the report states:

It should be pointed out that informal discussions of the committee with officials of the Department of Defense resulted in general agreement that its total budgeted request could in all probability be absorbed out of current funds.

I was merely trying to make certain that if it is absorbed out of current funds they would not then come back and try to tell us that we had to restore the money that had been taken from their appropriation. The Committee on Appropriations went before the Rules Committee and got a rule waiving points of order on their language which legislates in the bill, and I was simply trying to aid this committee in nailing down the situation so that any saving would be a permanent one and that they could not come back and ask that we reappropriate it.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman's idea is all right, and I am in complete harmony with the gentleman's amendment; we cannot be sure that the savings will be made, but we hope some savings will be made and that other programs can safely be postponed. This was a reappropriation of funds which were made available to us by reason of changed programs, the steel strike, and a number of other factors.

Mr. YORTY. Then are we to understand that the committee is not quite certain that this language would indicate that this saving can actually be made by transfer of funds from appropriations already made?

Mr. MAHON. The committee says that these funds can be absorbed; that does not necessarily mean a saving. It is too early to know the full effect of our action. If we have made a mistake, it can later be corrected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question or two of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services Appropriations, and also the former chairman and now the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. MAHON, of Texas. The item I refer to is carried on page 12, line 8: "Military personnel, Army, \$725,724,000." The hearings reveal that out of this sum of money there is \$300,000 earmarked for the purchase of paperbacked, pocket-sized books and magazines for distribution to the armed services personnel overseas. I wish to ask the gentleman whether or not he knows the type, the character, and contents of the books he anticipates will be bought with this \$300,000. I am not opposing the fighting man getting American books and magazines. The proper kind would be a good morale builder for our forces. I would be derelict in my duty if I did not point out to this body some of the revelations uncovered by the Select Committee on Pornographic Ma-

terials, which was created by the House in the last Congress.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The committee did not go into that, I will say to the gentleman; but as a result of a conversation with him subsequent to the hearings the committee has obtained a list which shows the publisher, author, and the title of the books which I understand are supposed to be covered by the \$300,000 in question.

Mr. GATHINGS. I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on page 545 of the hearings it was stated that 7,700 paperbound book kits were made available for shipment overseas. I believe the armed services have furnished the gentleman with only 4 or 5 sets of the books and magazines included in these kits; am I not right? If the gentleman will refer to the hearings at page 545 he will find that Colonel Isaacs said there were 7,700 paperbound book kits being made available.

I have a list of those particular titles that were furnished your committee. I am of the opinion that the titles furnished you represent only a small part of the total number being purchased by the Army.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not sure about the number.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think my colleague will find that each of the 7,700 kits is made up of the same titles. They are not 7,700 different kits of different titles. You will find that the 7,700 kits are made up of the same titles.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is the cause of my concern on this feature of the problem. I understood that Army officials have stated that hundreds of different titles are being purchased with funds appropriated by this Congress. I hope your committee gets the full facts with respect to the contracts of this material. Let me ask the gentleman from Florida this question: It is his intention as a member of the subcommittee to furnish a high, wholesome type of reading material for our armed services personnel?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is rendering a real contribution by raising this question, which has been brought up a number of times in our hearings in the past. We have specifically asked whether a very careful selection is made by a carefully selected board to determine that clean, wholesome literature is being provided for the men in the services and we have always been assured that is the case.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is being done and it is the policy of the subcommittee?

Mr. SIKES. That is the assurance the subcommittee has always received.

Mr. GATHINGS. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am sure that is the intention of the committee, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. At one time there was a board of educators who selected these books. Now, people vary in taste in respect to books. I know in times past the Armed Services personnel have been permitted generally speaking to read the same type of book that the public generally read. If a book is a best seller, even though it is not too wholesome from some standpoints, often it is made available to the Armed Services.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is the point I am getting to now. I refer to the so-called best sellers. Many of them are salacious, obscene, and undesirable. These particular books although they are available on American newsstands are filled with sordid filthy statements based upon sexual deviations and perversions. Some glamorize the use of dope.

Mr. MAHON. But I would like to say that the committee has insisted through the years that the services screen these books and select only wholesome types. I share the gentleman's feeling completely that no improper or obscene literature should be purchased with the taxpayer's money. I reaffirm our demand on the Armed Forces that no improper books be purchased. That has been our understanding all along.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman thinks that is being carried out?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. I trust that reasonable care be directed to this problem in order to sell America with its proud traditions to the nations of the world. The literature heretofore distributed through post exchanges has been most detrimental to us.

The United States has publishing facilities that could make our publications a great and powerful influence for good and the betterment of mankind all over the world. Instead, I regret to admit the truth that customs officials of other nations now look upon our country as the nation that has almost completely replaced the Parisian slums as the producer of the world's most morally depraved publications. And the extent of our mass production of this lascivious and depraved printed trash dumfound them.

The Australian Parliament found it necessary during the past year to devote considerable time to discussing effective means of preventing the importation from the United States of books, magazines, and comic strips that attempt to show sexual depravity and criminal activities in a favorable light.

The daily newspapers of the British Isles are writing intemperate editorials demanding action to stop the vast quantities of obscene materials published in the United States that have been entering Great Britain. An example of this reaction recently appeared in the London Sunday Express, which has a huge circulation. This newspaper advised its readers that—

In the United States, pornography is triumphant. There are some American best sellers which no English publisher would touch with a pair of tongs.

Our Ambassador to India, Chester Bowles, wrote an article in the New York Times magazine of January 4, 1953, en-

titled "How To Win Friends and Influence Asia." In pointing out the problems America faces in combating Soviet propaganda against us, Mr. Bowles states: "Further to distort his [the Asiatic's] impression of America is our trashy literature which crowds Asian newsstands and the blood and thunder comics brought home by his wide-eyed child."

The Philippine Government has advised this country that its Bureau of Customs has discovered huge quantities of indecent publications are being sold in the American military post exchanges that are barred by Philippine law. In fact, the Philippine Bureau of Customs has gone so far as to charge that the American military post exchanges have become smuggling points for the importation of indecent publications into that country.

French people visiting the United States are amazed at obscene books and magazines publicly displayed and being sold to young people in residential areas. This material can be bought surreptitiously in the back alleys of Paris, but the head of the French family unit is noted for the way he resolutely protects his children from degrading influences.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 144, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. In its present form.

The SPEAKER. Is anyone else opposed to the bill unqualifiedly?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill unqualifiedly.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman unqualifiedly opposed to the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill unqualifiedly.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 10, line 11, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$20,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 180, nays 201, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—180

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abernethy | Forand | Moss |
| Adair | Forrester | Moulder |
| Addonizio | Frazier | Multer |
| Albert | Friedel | Murray |
| Aspinall | Fulton | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Ayres | Garmatz | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Bailey | Gathings | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Barrett | Gentry | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Battle | Gordon | Passman |
| Bennett, Fla. | Granahan | Patman |
| Bentsen | Grant | Perkins |
| Blatnik | Green | Pfost |
| Boggs | Gregory | Philbin |
| Boland | Hagen, Calif. | Polk |
| Bolling | Haley | Powell |
| Bonin | Harris | Price |
| Boykin | Harrison, Va. | Priest |
| Brooks, La. | Hart | Radwan |
| Brooks, Tex. | Holifield | Rains |
| Brown, Ga. | Holtzman | Reams |
| Bryson | Howell | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Buchanan | Ikard | Riley |
| Buckley | Jarman | Rivers |
| Byrd | Javits | Roberts |
| Byrne, Pa. | Jones, Ala. | Rodino |
| Camp | Karsten, Mo. | Rogers, Colo. |
| Campbell | Kearney | Rogers, Fla. |
| Carnahan | Kearns | Rogers, Mass. |
| Celler | Kee | Rogers, Tex. |
| Chudoff | Kelly, N. Y. | Rooney |
| Colmer | Keogh | Roosevelt |
| Condon | Kersten, Wis. | Saylor |
| Cooper | Kilday | Secrest |
| Corbett | King, Calif. | Selden |
| Crosser | Klein | Sheppard |
| Davis, Ga. | Kluczynski | Sieminski |
| Davis, Tenn. | Landrum | Sikes |
| Dawson, Ill. | Lane | Smith, Miss. |
| Deane | Lanham | Spence |
| Delaney | Lantaff | Springer |
| Dempsey | Lesinski | Staggers |
| Dodd | Long | Steed |
| Dollinger | Lyle | Sullivan |
| Donohue | McCarthy | Sutton |
| Donovan | McCormack | Teague |
| Dorn, S. C. | McDonough | Thompson, La. |
| Dowdy | McMillan | Thompson, Tex. |
| Doyle | Machrowicz | Trimble |
| Eberharter | Mack, Ill. | Van Zandt |
| Edmondson | Madden | Vinson |
| Elliott | Magnuson | Watts |
| Engle | Mahon | Whitten |
| Evins | Marshall | Wickersham |
| Fallon | Matthews | Wier |
| Fenton | Morrow | Williams, Miss. |
| Fernandez | Metcalfe | Willis |
| Fine | Miller, Calif. | Winstead |
| Fino | Mills | Withers |
| Fisher | Mollohan | Yorty |
| Fogarty | Morrison | Zablocki |

NAYS—201

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abbitt | Brown, Ohio | Dawson, Utah |
| Alexander | Brownson | Derounian |
| Allen, Calif. | Broyhill | Devereux |
| Allen, Ill. | Budge | D'Ewart |
| Andersen, | Burdick | Dies |
| H. Carl | Burleson | Dolliver |
| Andresen, | Busbey | Dorn, N. Y. |
| August H. | Bush | Ellsworth |
| Andrews | Byrnes, Wis. | Ford |
| Angell | Canfield | Fountain |
| Arends | Cannon | Frelinghuysen |
| Auchincloss | Carlyle | Gamble |
| Baker | Carrigg | Gary |
| Barden | Chenoweth | Gavin |
| Bates | Chiperfield | George |
| Beamer | Church | Golden |
| Becker | Clardy | Goodwin |
| Belcher | Clevenger | Graham |
| Bender | Cole, Mo. | Gross |
| Bennett, Mich. | Cole, N. Y. | Gubser |
| Bentley | Coon | Gwinn |
| Berry | Cotton | Hale |
| Betts | Cretella | Halleck |
| Bishop | Crumpacker | Hand |
| Bolton, | Cunningham | Harden |
| Oliver P. | Curtis, Mass. | Hardy |
| Bosch | Curtis, Mo. | Harrison, Nebr. |
| Bow | Curtis, Nebr. | Harrison, Wyo. |
| Bramblett | Dague | Harvey |
| Bray | Davis, Wis. | Herlong |

Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillelson
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Holt
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Hruska
Hull
Hunter
Jackson
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas, Ill.
Jonas, N. C.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Kean
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lovre
Lucas
McConnell
McCulloch
McGregor
McIntire

McVey
Mack, Wash.
Mailliard
Merrill
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Morano
Mumma
Neal
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
Oakman
O'Hara, Minn.
Osmer
Ostertag
Patterson
Pelly
Phillips
Pillion
Poff
Prouty
Ray
Rayburn
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Robeson, Va.
Sadlak
St. George
Schenck
Scherer
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown

Shafer
Sheehan
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Small
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Stauffer
Stringfellow
Taber
Talle
Thomas
Thompson, Mich.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Utt
Van Pelt
Velde
Vorys
Wainwright
Wampler
Warburton
Welchel
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Tex.
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Yates
Young
Younger

NOT VOTING—51

Bolton,
Frances P.
Bonner
Case
Cederberg
Chatham
Chelf
Cooley
Coudert
Dingell
Dondero
Durham
Feighan
Hagen, Minn.
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert
Heller

Hoffman, Ill.
Hyde
James
Jenkins
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kirwan
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Meador
Miller, Kans.
Miller, N. Y.
Morgan
O'Konski
O'Neill
Patten
Pilcher
Poage

Poulson
Preston
Rabaut
Reed, Ill.
Richards
Robson, Ky.
Scott
Shelley
Shuford
Smith, Wis.
Taylor
Vursell
Walter
Wheeler
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Richards for, with Mr. James against.
Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.
Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Keating against.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton against.
Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.
Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.
Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Hyde against.
Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Cederberg against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Dondero against.
Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Williams of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Case with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Hagen of Minnesota with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois with Mr. Hays of Arkansas.
Mr. Jenkins with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Preston.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Wheeler.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Durham.
Mr. Robson of Kentucky with Mr. Pilcher.

Messrs. FENTON, BONIN, CELLER, LONG, SHEPPARD, McMILLAN, and ZABLOCKI changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Messrs. NICHOLSON and CANNON demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 369, nays 2, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—369

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Andresen,
August H.
Andrews
Angell
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bailey
Barden
Barrett
Bates
Battle
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bender
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Bentsen
Betts
Bishop
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton,
Oliver P.
Bonin
Bosch
Bow
Boykin
Bramblett
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley
Budge
Burleson
Busbey
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Campbell
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carrigg
Celler
Chenoweth
Chilperfield
Chudoff
Church
Clardy
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Condon
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Cretella
Cresser
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.

Curtis, Nebr.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Derounian
Devereux
D'Ewart
Dies
Dodd
Dollinger
Dolliver
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Eberharter
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fino
Fisher
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gamble
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
George
Golden
Goodwin
Gordon
Graham
Granahan
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hagen, Calif.
Hale
Haley
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Hart
Harvey
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hillelson
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Hollfield
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Hope
Horan

Hosmer
Howell
Hruska
Hunter
Ikard
Jackson
Jarman
Javits
Jensen
Johnson
Jonas, Ill.
Jonas, N. C.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Kee
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
King, Calif.
King, Pa.
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lantaff
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Long
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McGregor
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Mathews
Merrill
Morrow
Metcalfe
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mollohan
Morano
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
Murray
Neal
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
Osmer
Ostertag
Passman

Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Phillips
Pillion
Poff
Polk
Powell
Price
Priest
Prouty
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Rayburn
Reams
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Regan
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney

Roosevelt
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shafer
Sheehan
Sheppard
Short
Sieminski
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Small
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Stauffer
Steed
Stringfellow
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, Tex.

Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Wainwright
Wampler
Warburton
Watts
Welchel
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Withers
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Yorty
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—2

Hull Sutton

NOT VOTING—61

Baker
Berry
Bolton,
Frances P.
Bonner
Burdick
Case
Cederberg
Chatham
Chelf
Coudert
Curtis, Mass.
Dawson, Ill.
Dingell
Dondero
Durham
Feighan
Hagen, Minn.
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hébert

Heller
Hill
Hoffman, Ill.
Hyde
James
Jenkins
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kilday
Kirwan
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Meador
Miller, Kans.
Miller, N. Y.
Morgan
Oakman
O'Konski
O'Neill
Patten
Pilcher

Poage
Poulson
Preston
Rabaut
Reed, Ill.
Richards
Robson, Ky.
Scott
Shelley
Shuford
Smith, Wis.
Taylor
Teague
Thomas
Vursell
Walter
Wheeler
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Williams of New York with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Smith of Wisconsin with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Hyde with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. James with Mr. Heller.
Mr. Jenkins with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Mason with Mr. O'Neill.
Mr. Miller of New York with Mr. Hays of Arkansas.
Mr. Oakman with Mr. Patten.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Preston.
Mr. Reed of Illinois with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Robson of Kentucky with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dondero with Mr. Shelley.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Shuford.
Mr. Cederberg with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Case with Mr. Walter.
Mrs. Frances P. Bolton with Mr. Teague.
Mr. Baker with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois with Mr. Wheeler.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Yates.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Hagen of Minnesota with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Berry with Mr. Durham.
Mr. Hill with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Vursell with Mr. Richards.
Mr. O'Konski with Mr. Kilday.
Mr. Meador with Mr. Rabaut.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Pennsylvania delegation, I am greatly disappointed that the membership of the House did not see fit to amend the supplemental appropriation bill before us to definitely tie down the instructions of the Committee to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in regard to furnishing adequate hospitalization for the needy veterans in the Philadelphia area.

This matter has been given very careful consideration by the members of the Pennsylvania delegation in conference with representatives of the veterans' organizations in our State. We feel that the Veterans' Administration has not been living up to the long-recognized allotment of beds in the naval hospital at Philadelphia, especially so when that hospital has what you might call a "staff in waiting" ready to relieve the situation.

I take heart from the promise of Chairman JOHN PHILLIPS and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], a member of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, that they will see to it that the directive to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in regard to hospitalization for veterans in the Philadelphia area is carried into action. We are depending on this.

AMENDING THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3073) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been consulted about this bill, and I think it is the proper thing to do.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 4 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended by the act of August 4, 1939 (Public, No. 263, 76th Cong.), which is referred to in paragraph (5) of section 3A of such act, is amended by striking out the colon after the word "section" and the following: "Provided, That no election in lieu of the life annuity provided herein shall become effective in case an employee dies within 30 days after the effective date of retirement, and in the event of such death within this period, such death shall be considered as a death in active service."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of January 1, 1953.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CORAL M. HOME

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution

(H. Res. 143) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Coral M. Home, widow of John D. Home, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said John D. Home.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSIDERATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL BILL ORDERED FOR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday next for the Speaker to recognize the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2332) to require an annual review of military personnel requirements, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 23

(Mr. RAYBURN asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 minute.)

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader what the program will be for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. Monday there will be the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

Tuesday there are six resolutions for committee studies and investigations which we expect to call up. They are for the following committees: Judiciary, Ways and Means, Post Office and Civil Service, Foreign Affairs, Education and Labor, and Armed Services.

Wednesday: We expect to call the bill H. R. 2332 providing for an annual review of military personnel, sometimes referred to as having to do with the Davis amendment. That will be called up under a suspension of the rules, pursuant to the request just granted.

Also on Wednesday, if a rule is granted, we expect to call up House Joint Resolution 160, to amend the National Housing Act, which resolution comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman thinks in all probability that will be the entire program for next week?

Mr. HALLECK. As far as I know, yes; that is the program.

THE SITUATION IN THE VIRGINIA COAL FIELDS

(Mr. WAMPLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a situation which is vitally affecting the economic life of my congressional district.

Virginia is the Nation's sixth largest coal producer, and about 99 percent of the entire State output comes from the mines in my congressional district. The coal industry is one of our principal mediums of livelihood, and as such is one of the largest contributors to the whole economy of this great mountain empire.

Coal production in Virginia during 1951 amounted to 21,410,000 tons, or 4.01 percent of the entire United States tonnage.

During 1952, Virginia's coal tonnage dropped 1,600,000 tons. Figures for 1952 are estimated on the basis of 11 months because State production for December is not yet published.

However, production figures for the entire Nation through December are completed and on that basis, it is estimated that Virginia produced 19,810,000 tons of coal during 1952.

A loss of 1,600,000 tons has had a very serious effect upon the State's 17,683 coal miners and their wives and children.

This decrease in coal production in my district caused 1,283 of our miners to be without work for the year. This is how a drop in production affects the working people of the Ninth District of Virginia.

Such a condition has caused an unfavorable reaction in virtually every phase of our economy.

After having made a study of the problems creating these conditions of hardship in my district, it is my considered opinion that one of the major factors contributing to this depressing influence on the coal industry is the unfair competition that has come to the coal market in the form of a foreign residual oil, a product for which we have absolutely no need at the present time, and on which we would certainly not wish to rely for future supply.

Residual fuel oil is competitive with coal for the generation of electric power and for other industrial uses. The amount of such oil imported into the east coast of this country last year was sufficient to inflict a 31-million-ton loss on coal markets, and no relief is in sight unless the 83d Congress acts to curb this unfair competition which has its origin in foreign refineries.

Total coal reserves in the United States to the end of 1951 were 1,211,646,289,000 tons. There is enough mineable coal in America to last more than 1,000 years.

The coal industry is one of America's vital industries. It has made tremendous contributions to America's strength—both in war and in peace.

The American coal industry has never received Government subsidies—it has never asked for them, and I don't believe that it ever will.

I do not believe that it is just for the Congress to permit the continuance of a state of affairs by which the coal industry in Virginia and elsewhere is being materially weakened and its working force threatened with unemployment.

I have today introduced a bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil.

I ask the Members of Congress to take immediate action to remedy this situation.

A MOTION PICTURE NOW BEING PRODUCED IN NEW MEXICO

(Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, there is being produced at the present time in Silver City, N. Mex., a motion picture. The unique part of the motion picture is that it is being produced and financed by uncooperative witnesses who appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The picture and its production have been condemned by the motion picture industry and by all of the labor unions connected with that industry.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD of yesterday as follows: On page 1252, in the third column, substitute "\$8 billion" for "\$10 billion"; and on page 1253, substitute "\$47 billion" for "\$45 billion."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LIBERATION OF LITHUANIA

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of Lithuanian independence accords to every American another opportunity to ponder the cruel fate that has beset and still afflicts the historic and gallant Lithuanian nation.

The people of Lithuania have a noble heritage. For centuries they have struggled for freedom and the values of democratic civilization. Their sons and daughters have contributed with conspicuous effect to the defense, the development, the welfare and protection of our own great Nation. Citizens of Lith-

uanian descent are among the very best in the country and our hearts go out to them today when we know they are stirred by poignant, bitter memories, by unspeakable anguish and woe at the suffering and oppression of their kin folk in the native homeland.

The oppression they suffer is not confined to Lithuania alone, however. It reaches over and encompasses many formerly free lands and many noble peoples. It is the living, visual, everyday expression and demonstration of the callous brutality of the Soviet slave state and the monstrous iniquities which communism has perpetrated in this world.

These great crimes against mankind, against the most cherished ideals of free peoples, against organized religion, against the rights of free men, against the spiritual values of our civilization, against the sacred tenets of the Almighty himself, must definitely be repudiated by this Government. It would be shameful, sinful, and disparaging of the precious blood which so many selfless, gallant American boys have shed for freedom, it would be a profanation of their immortal sacrifice for this Nation, for our Government longer to make itself a part of, or in any respect to tolerate, or acquiesce in, the brutal, criminal, immoral, and illegal domination by the Soviet Union of Lithuania and other small free nations.

One of the most gratifying developments that has occurred in the foreign policy of this Nation for many years has been the forthright repudiation by President Eisenhower of the unconstitutional, illegal, secret agreements and understandings, which were entered into at Yalta, Potsdam, and other international conferences. This inspiring message, conceived in the kind of firm courage that we like to believe is characteristic of our American Nation, has given new hope and fresh inspiration to millions of helpless, heretofore hopeless, human beings held captive behind the Iron Curtain, ground into insensibility, chained into slavery, tortured by unmentionable abuses and excesses of power-crazed, zealous, Marxist-inspired assassins, imposed upon them a bestial tyranny worse than death.

The executive agreements that support these secret understandings are not, in my opinion, worth the paper they are written on. They were never ratified by the United States Senate, as required by the Constitution, and they never had either the moral or political support of the overwhelming majority of the American people, who, to the contrary, predominantly and bitterly oppose them.

We cannot move too fast, or in too determined a manner, to scrap these inhuman, unconstitutional, and undemocratic understandings and inform Soviet leaders intent upon world conquest that we do not recognize any conquest and infiltration of territories or nations that have been accomplished through chicanery, aggression, or deceit, and that have enslaved free nations.

World peace and world order can never be based upon confiscation, aggression, exploitation, or brutal tyranny over helpless nations and individuals. World

peace, if it is to be achieved, must rest upon the firm foundations of justice and the moral sanction of civilized human beings. A peace that does not have the public opinion of the world behind it, that is supported by force, incredible police-state methods, denial of human rights, brutalization of the individual, ruthless enmity toward free institutions and the free way of life, has no more chance of lasting than a snowflake upon the river's bosom.

Let it be known in this House, on this great anniversary day of Lithuania, which we so fittingly commemorate, that the Members of the American Congress, reflecting the sentiments of the American people, still believe in and stand for principles of liberty and justice, that we are willing to declare them to the world, that we are willing to defend and fight for them if we have to, and that we have no intention of permitting world dictators, whether in wolf's or sheep's clothing, to stride over the whole world trampling upon the most sacred rights of men and women, conspiring against democracy and working for the destruction of all free governments, including that of our own great Republic.

Neither the bluster of Soviet Jingoism, nor the timidity and cupidity of some of our own so-called allies, nor the vagrant fears of weak-kneed Americans should ever deter this Nation, not only from taking a sympathetic stand toward Lithuania, Poland, and other oppressed small nations, but from moving with all feasible speed and dispatch to liberate them from the cruel and tormenting plight of having to live in chains under the domination of tyrants more cruel than Nero.

I express my satisfaction at this time that American foreign policy is seemingly moving courageously in the direction of supporting and encouraging the real forces of freedom in this world, as well as reinforcing and redeclaring our purpose, unflinching and determined to preserve our own priceless freedoms against any and every threat.

FARM PRICES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LAIRD and to include an editorial.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include an article.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include two editorials.

ginia [Mr. NEELY], I introduce for reference to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, a bill to bring disability benefits under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act up to date.

Since 1948 there has been no increase in disability compensation benefits for working people covered by this act.

Present benefits range from a minimum of \$12 to a maximum of \$35 a week. Existing law provides that no benefits are to be paid for the first 7 days of disability but that if the disability continues for 49 days, benefits are allowable from the day of injury.

The proposed bill would amend the present law in four respects:

First. Increase minimum weekly benefits to \$20.

Second. Increase maximum weekly benefits to \$50.

Third. Reduce the qualifying period to 3 days.

Fourth. Reduce the period for obtaining full compensation from the date of injury to 14 days.

In recognition of increases in the cost of living, Congress has liberalized benefits under the Social Security Act and raised the minimum wage.

The bill appears to me to be in line with congressional policy. I urge its early consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1054) to amend section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 906), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. (a) No compensation shall be allowed for the first 3 days of the disability, except the benefits provided for in section 7: *Provided, however,* That in case the injury results in disability of more than 14 days, the compensation shall be allowed from the date of disability.

"(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed \$50 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than \$20 per week: *Provided, however,* That if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than \$20 per week he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 3073. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with

respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRINTING OF STUDY ENTITLED "STATE AND MUNICIPAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION" (S. DOC. NO. 15)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a study entitled "State and Municipal Fair Employment Legislation" prepared under the National Security Resources Board for the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, of which I was chairman, of the 82d Congress, be printed as a Senate document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTI- CLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE AP- PENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by him before the annual meeting of the American Road Builders Association, at Boston, Mass., on Monday, February 9, 1953.

By Mr. WILEY:

Lincoln Day address delivered by him, together with article by George Sokolsky.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in New York City on February 14, 1953.

Copy of letter addressed to President Eisenhower by a group of citizens, proposing a program of action with respect to recent manifestations of Soviet anti-Semitism.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Essay on the value of electricity to our farmers written by Miss Jolene Yates, of Omaha, Va.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

New regulations adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission regarding the conduct of present and former members of the Commission, together with a brief statement by himself.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Editorial entitled "Truman Tidelands Order Marred a Graceful Exit," published in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Editorial entitled "Eisenhower and Quay County Farmer," published in the Tucumcari American-Leader, February 12, 1953.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Article entitled "Moral Rearmament Answer to War Lords," written by Gould Lincoln in his syndicated column "The Political Mill," and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 7, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Noble Words Don't Erase British Inconsistencies," published in the Miami Herald of February 8, 1953.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Statement on the struggle for Armenian independence.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

Article entitled "History of European Soil Conservation," published in the September 1952 issue of the Mid-West Dealer News.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Congress To Launch Probe in Interests of Consumer," written by

Thomas L. Stokes and published in the Des Moines (Iowa) Tribune on February 16, 1953.

By Mr. BEALL:

Article entitled "Modernization of Chesapeake & Delaware Canal Is Proposed," published in the Baltimore Evening Sun of February 16, 1953.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 24, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 457, Senate Office Building, on S. 15, the omnibus judgeship bill; S. 688, dividing the State of Florida into three judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court thereon; S. 732, to create an additional district judgeship for the eastern district of Texas, and to make permanent the district judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by the act of August 3, 1949; and S. 928, to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of New Jersey. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, next Sunday afternoon I shall attend memorial services in St. George's Episcopal Church in Fredericksburg, Va., which was the church of George Washington's mother and the church which Washington attended when he was in Fredericksburg.

In paying tribute on the 22d of February to the memory of the Father of our Country it may be well for us to recall that the Founding Fathers who drafted in Philadelphia in 1787 a Constitution which crystallized their belief in a capitalistic nation and a system of free competitive enterprise united to select as the head of the new Government an outstanding businessman.

If we properly appraise the land which Washington owned at the time he was elected President, including thousands of rich acres on the Monongahela River in what is now Washington County, Pa., he was the richest man in the country and also one of the best businessmen.

Before the development of railways, transportation in the new Nation was limited to wagons traveling roads at times virtually impassable and to the commerce on our rivers and canals. Appreciating the importance of transportation for the promotion of internal prosperity Washington advocated a canal system to connect Chesapeake Bay with the Ohio River and in a letter on this

subject to Gov. Benjamin Harrison of Virginia, he said:

It is necessary to apply the cement of interest to bind all parts of the Union together with indissoluble bonds. The western settlers have no means of coming to us except by long land transportations and unimproved roads. But smooth the road and make easy the way for them and see how amazingly our exports will be increased and how amply we shall be compensated for the trouble and expense of effecting it.

"Smooth the road and make easy the way for them and see how amazingly our exports will be increased" applies as forcibly today to our trade with Western Europe and the friendship which such trade engenders as it did in the days when Washington sought to apply the principle to trade between Virginia and the area Virginia once claimed, known as the Northwest Territory of which Ohio was a part.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last Friday a few of us who were present spoke, on immediate impulse, of our affection and regard for the late Elbert D. Thomas, whose untimely passing last week so shocked and saddened us.

I have prepared a statement supplementary to what I said on that day, to express my deep appreciation of the privilege of knowing a very great and very lovable man, who was such an adornment to the United States Senate during all the years he served here. He will go down in history, I know, as one of the notable men in the United States Senate and as one of the many great contributions made to the Nation by the State of Utah.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Elbert Thomas served here for 18 years—for 18 of the most eventful years in modern times. He was not a man who would appeal to the thoughtless and shallow-minded. He was above all a man of thought and of reflection, and secondarily a man of action.

His quiet contributions to the public welfare are reflected in the wage standards of the workers of this country as well as in scores of other vital aspects of our national life. He understood and appreciated as few others did the worth and dignity of every human being. He was always a friend of the oppressed and the humble.

He loved our free Government, and spent long hours of study on legislation designed to strengthen and refine it. His interests were mainly intellectual ones. He loved to read on the subject of history, in which he was especially proficient, but there was no subject under the sun which was outside his realm of interest. He felt himself to be, in the Senate as he had been before he came to the Senate, a teacher and a missionary.

He had no bite nor sting. His wisdom sometimes rebuked careless and shoddy ideas, but I recall no personal reproach ever to pass his lips. He was patient with all who were doing their best and who were sincere in their beliefs. So scholarly was he that he was commonly referred to as "the erudite Senator from Utah," and his scholarship was his trademark.

He loved people. The students who had studied under him still looked to him for personal counsel and guidance years after they had graduated from his classes. And he maintained his interest in them far into their maturity.

During the great test and climax of the war years and of demobilization he was chairman of both the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and also of the Military Affairs Committee. I do not have direct knowledge of his work on the Military Affairs Committee. Others here are in a better position than I to speak of that aspect of his great work. But I know that as chairman of the Labor Committee, Senator Thomas appreciated and insisted that the general welfare

clause of the Constitution was meant to be a beacon for the further development of our national life. It was not just an empty phrase.

His chairmanship of our committee was always characterized by a persistent and successful effort to bring agreement out of disagreement, to delegate as much responsibility as possible, to give every possible leeway to the initiative of the members of his committee and to encourage them in thinking it was their committee and not his.

Presiding above all his other attributes, was that characteristic to which I referred in my remarks last week—a perfect humility. He was a humble man in the Biblical sense of that word. He was humble because he was aware of his heavy responsibilities. He died in the midst of discharging those responsibilities, and his monument is both his contribution in public office and his fine, noble character.

His passing was a great loss, but his memory will long live among us.

APPORTIONMENT OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE VOTE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1952 ON THE BASIS OF THE POPULAR VOTE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a tabulation prepared at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, showing the apportionment of the electoral college vote on the basis of the popular vote in the presidential election of 1952. In other words, it shows what the distribution of the electoral votes would have been had the so-called Lodge constitutional amendment been in force, under which the electoral vote would have been allocated on the basis of the popular vote.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Apportionment of electoral college votes on the basis of the popular vote, presidential election of 1952 (Eisenhower, Republican—Stevenson, Democrat)

| State | Total popular vote | Electoral votes | | Republican | | | Democratic | | | Other | | |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | Republican | Democrat | Popular vote | Percent of total | Electoral votes (Lodge-Gossett) | Popular vote | Percent of total | Electoral votes (Lodge-Gossett) | Popular vote | Percent of total | Electoral votes (Lodge-Gossett) |
| Alabama | 426,120 | | 11 | 149,231 | 35.0 | 3.85 | 275,075 | 64.5 | 7.1 | 1,814 | 0.5 | .05 |
| Arizona | 260,589 | 4 | | 152,042 | 58.4 | 2.3 | 108,527 | 41.6 | 1.7 | | | |
| Arkansas | 404,800 | | 8 | 177,155 | 43.8 | 3.5 | 226,300 | 55.9 | 4.5 | 1,345 | .3 | |
| California | 5,141,849 | 32 | | 2,897,310 | 56.4 | 18.0 | 2,197,548 | 42.7 | 13.7 | 46,991 | .9 | .3 |
| Colorado | 1,103,103 | 6 | | 379,782 | 60.3 | 3.6 | 245,504 | 38.9 | 2.3 | 4,817 | .8 | .1 |
| Connecticut | 1,596,911 | 8 | | 611,012 | 55.7 | 4.5 | 481,649 | 43.9 | 3.5 | 4,250 | .4 | |
| Delaware | 174,010 | 3 | | 90,059 | 51.7 | 1.6 | 83,315 | 47.9 | 1.4 | 636 | .4 | |
| Florida | 988,986 | | 12 | 544,036 | 55.0 | 5.5 | 444,950 | 45.0 | 4.5 | | | |
| Georgia | 651,303 | 10 | | 198,979 | 30.6 | 3.7 | 452,323 | 69.4 | 8.3 | | | |
| Idaho | 276,254 | 4 | | 180,707 | 65.4 | 2.6 | 95,081 | 34.4 | 1.4 | 1 | | |
| Illinois | 4,481,058 | 27 | | 2,457,327 | 54.8 | 14.8 | 2,013,920 | 45.0 | 12.15 | 466 | .2 | |
| Indiana | 1,955,325 | 13 | | 1,136,259 | 58.1 | 7.6 | 801,530 | 41.0 | 5.3 | 9,811 | .2 | .05 |
| Iowa | 1,268,773 | 10 | | 808,906 | 63.8 | 6.4 | 451,513 | 35.6 | 3.5 | 17,536 | .9 | .1 |
| Kansas | 896,166 | 8 | | 616,302 | 68.8 | 5.5 | 273,296 | 30.5 | 2.4 | 8,354 | .6 | .06 |
| Kentucky | 993,148 | | 10 | 495,029 | 49.8 | 5.0 | 495,729 | 49.9 | 5.0 | 6,568 | .7 | .1 |
| Louisiana | 651,952 | | 10 | 306,925 | 47.1 | 4.7 | 345,027 | 52.9 | 5.3 | 2,390 | .3 | |
| Maine | 351,786 | 5 | | 232,353 | 66.0 | 3.3 | 118,806 | 33.8 | 1.7 | | | |
| Maryland | 902,074 | 9 | | 499,424 | 55.4 | 5.0 | 395,337 | 43.8 | 3.9 | 627 | .2 | |
| Massachusetts | 2,383,398 | 16 | | 1,292,325 | 54.2 | 8.7 | 1,083,525 | 45.5 | 7.3 | 7,313 | .8 | .07 |
| Michigan | 2,798,592 | 20 | | 1,551,529 | 55.4 | 11.1 | 1,230,657 | 44.0 | 8.8 | 7,548 | .3 | |
| Minnesota | 1,379,483 | 11 | | 763,211 | 55.3 | 6.1 | 608,458 | 44.1 | 4.8 | 16,406 | .6 | .1 |
| Mississippi | 285,519 | | 8 | 112,966 | 39.6 | 3.2 | 172,553 | 60.4 | 4.8 | 7,814 | .6 | .06 |
| Missouri | 1,892,062 | 13 | | 959,429 | 50.7 | 6.6 | 929,830 | 49.1 | 6.4 | | | |
| Montana | 265,037 | 4 | | 157,394 | 59.4 | 2.4 | 106,213 | 40.1 | 1.6 | 2,803 | .2 | |
| Nebraska | 609,660 | 6 | | 421,603 | 69.2 | 4.2 | 183,057 | 30.8 | 1.8 | 1,430 | .5 | |
| Nevada | 82,190 | 3 | | 50,502 | 61.4 | 1.8 | 31,688 | 38.6 | 1.2 | | | |
| New Hampshire | 272,952 | 4 | | 166,289 | 60.9 | 2.4 | 106,663 | 39.1 | 1.6 | | | |
| New Jersey | 2,419,554 | 16 | | 1,374,613 | 56.8 | 9.1 | 1,015,902 | 42.0 | 6.7 | | | |
| New Mexico | 238,608 | 4 | | 132,170 | 55.4 | 2.2 | 105,661 | 44.3 | 1.8 | 29,039 | 1.2 | .2 |
| New York | 7,128,241 | 45 | | 3,952,815 | 55.4 | 24.9 | 3,104,601 | 43.6 | 19.6 | 777 | .3 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 70,825 | 1.0 | .5 |

83D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3053

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 20, 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply sup-
5 plemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,
6 1953, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 For payment to Ona Stigler, widow of William G.
11 Stigler, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma,
12 \$12,500.

1 For payment to Mae Ruth Sabath, widow of Adolph
2 J. Sabath, late a Representative from the State of Illinois,
3 \$12,500.

4 For payment to Grace Hill Cox, widow of Eugene E.
5 Cox, late a Representative from the State of Georgia,
6 \$12,500.

7 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

8 Furniture: For an additional amount for "Furniture",
9 \$58,750, to remain available until June 30, 1954, and the
10 unexpended balance of the appropriation, "Contingent ex-
11 penses, House of Representatives, furniture, 1952", is hereby
12 made available until June 30, 1954.

13 Special and select committees: For an additional amount
14 for salaries and expenses of special and select committees
15 authorized by the House, \$500,000.

16 Stationery (revolving fund) : For an additional amount
17 for "Stationery (revolving fund) ", for the first session of the
18 Eighty-third Congress, \$800, to remain available until
19 expended.

20 Automobiles for majority and minority leaders: Funds
21 appropriated for "Contingent expenses of the House" are
22 hereby made available for purchase, exchange, driving,

1 maintenance, repair, and operation of two automobiles, one
2 for the majority leader of the House, and one for the minority
3 leader of the House.

4 EDUCATION OF SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

5 For an additional amount for Education of Senate, House,
6 and Supreme Court pages, \$2,570.

7 THE JUDICIARY

8 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

9 FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

10 For an additional amount for "Fees of commissioners",
11 \$107,000.

12 FEES OF JURORS

13 For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors", \$200,000.

14 MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

15 For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous salaries",
16 \$20,600.

17 SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

18 For an additional amount for "Salaries of court re-
19 porters", \$15,700.

20 SALARIES OF REFEREES

21 For an additional amount for "Salaries of referees",
22 \$134,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall be avail-

1 able for payment of the salaries of referees at the increased
2 rates authorized by the Judicial Conference of the United
3 States in September 1952, effective as of October 1, 1952.

4 CHAPTER II

5 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

6 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,
7 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

8 CONSTRUCTION

9 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$2,500,-
10 000, to remain available until expended.

11 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

12 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

13 ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR-NAVIGATION FACILITIES

14 For an additional amount for "Establishment of air-
15 navigation facilities", \$2,500,000, to remain available until
16 expended.

17 FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

18 For an additional amount for "Federal-aid airport pro-
19 gram, Federal Airport Act", for liquidation of obligations
20 incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head
21 to enter into contracts, \$3,500,000, to remain available until
22 June 30, 1955.

PATENT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
\$100,000.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

For an additional amount for "Federal-aid highways", to
remain available until expended, \$185,000,000, which sum
is composed of \$72,500,000, the remainder of the amount
authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, and
\$112,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appro-
priated for the fiscal year 1952.

ACCESS ROADS (ACT OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1950)

For an additional amount for "Access roads (Act of
September 7, 1950)" for liquidation of obligations incurred
pursuant to the contract authority granted by the Act of
October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422), \$8,000,000, to remain
available until expended.

CHAPTER III

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the
public debt", \$750,000.

1

CHAPTER IV

2

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

3

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

4

GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

5

AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

6

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration", \$6,750,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available for expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684).

13

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS

14

For payments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$27,200,000, to remain available until June 30, 1954.

18

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

19

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$150,000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Economic Stabilization Agency, 1953" and \$50,000 shall be derived

21

22

23

1 by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses,
2 Mexican Farm Labor Program, 1953", to remain available
3 until July 31, 1953: *Provided*, That these funds shall be
4 utilized solely for the continuation through June 1953 of a
5 consumer price index upon the same basis employed by the
6 Bureau of Labor Statistics in compiling such an index for
7 the period prior to January 1, 1953.

8 FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

9 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

10 PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

11 For an additional amount for "Payments to school
12 districts", \$20,500,000.

13 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND

15 SURVIVORS INSURANCE

16 The amount authorized by the Federal Security Agency
17 Appropriation Act, 1953, to be expended from the Federal
18 old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, for "Salaries and
19 expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance", is
20 increased from "\$60,500,000" to "\$62,500,000".

21 GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

22 For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public
23 assistance", \$340,000,000.

1

CHAPTER V

2

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

3

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

4

RESEARCH IN THE UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

5

For an additional amount for "Research in the utilization of saline water", \$50,000.

7

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

8

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

9

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", \$60,000.

11

BUREAU OF MINES

12

HEALTH AND SAFETY

13

For an additional amount for "Health and safety", \$266,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available for the purchase of fifty passenger motor vehicles in addition to those heretofore provided.

18

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF

19

REVIEW

20

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21

For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$20,000.

22

23

CHAPTER VI

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, \$25,000.

EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL DEFENSE

For an additional amount for "Emergency fund for the President, national defense", \$75,000.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

INVESTIGATIONS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422, approved January 9, 1953, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, \$1,000,000, to be

1 derived by transfer from the appropriation for "International
2 Information and Educational Activities", Department of
3 State Appropriation Act, 1953: *Provided*, That this ap-
4 propriation may be apportioned for use pursuant to Section
5 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, prior to April 1,
6 1953: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be
7 available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable
8 appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission
9 and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses in-
10 curred by such agencies under said Executive order.

11 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

12 The limitation under this head in the Independent Offices
13 Appropriation Act, 1953, as amended by the Supplemental
14 Appropriation Act, 1953, on the amount available for ex-
15 penses of travel, is hereby increased from "\$1,648,275" to
16 "\$1,800,000".

17 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

18 ADMINISTRATION, MEDICAL, HOSPITAL, AND DOMICILIARY
19 SERVICES

20 For an additional amount for "Administration, medical,
21 hospital, and domiciliary services", \$10,000,000.

22 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

23 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
24 sions", \$237,573,000, to remain available until expended.

1 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

2 For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits",
3 \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

4 SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITIES

5 For an additional amount for "Servicemen's indem-
6 nities", \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

7 VETERANS' MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS

8 For an additional amount for "Veterans' miscellaneous
9 benefits", \$1,361,000, to remain available until expended.

10 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

11 For an additional amount for "Grants to the Republic of
12 the Philippines", \$1,000,000.

13 REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

14 SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF

15 The appropriation heretofore granted for "Soldiers' and
16 sailors' civil relief" is hereby reduced by the sum of \$1,000,-
17 000, and said amount shall be carried to the surplus of the
18 Treasury.

19 CHAPTER VII

20 CIVIL FUNCTIONS

21 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

22 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

23 Not to exceed \$15,000 of the amount appropriated
24 under this head in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act,

1 1953, for construction and major equipment, shall be avail-
2 able for payment to the Republic of Panama for an ex-
3 pansion of its Colon sewage disposal facilities to serve the
4 Canal Zone.

5 PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

6 The amount made available under this head in the
7 Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953, for general and
8 administrative expenses of the Panama Canal Company, is
9 hereby increased from “\$3,301,800” to “\$3,557,000”.

10 CHAPTER VIII

11 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

12 MILITARY FUNCTIONS

13 For additional amounts for the following appropriations
14 of not to exceed the amounts stated:

15 “Claims”, Department of Defense, \$1,000,000;

16 “Retired pay”, Department of Defense, \$25,000,000;

17 “Military personnel, Army”, \$725,724,000;

18 “Military personnel, Navy”, \$140,000,000;

19 “Military personnel, Marine Corps”, \$63,000,000;

20 “Military personnel requirements”, Department of the
21 Air Force, \$115,000,000; the foregoing amounts under this
22 heading to be derived by transfer from such appropriations

1 available to the Department of Defense for obligation during
2 the fiscal year 1953 as may be designated by the Secretary
3 of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau
4 of the Budget.

5 DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

6 MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

7 The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Marine
8 Corps troops and facilities, 1951" shall remain available
9 during the fiscal year 1954 for liquidation of obligations in-
10 curred thereunder for procurement of ordnance, ammunition,
11 and other military equipment.

12 SHIPS AND FACILITIES

13 The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Ships
14 and facilities, 1951" shall remain available during the fiscal
15 year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder
16 for procurement of electronics equipment.

17 ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

18 The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Ordnance
19 and facilities, 1951" shall remain available during the fiscal
20 year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder
21 for (1) production and procurement of Navy ordnance and
22 ammunition and (2) procurement of plant equipment,
23 appliances, and machine tools.

1 DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

2 AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

3 Of the appropriation granted under this head in the
4 Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953,
5 \$1,685,044,000 shall be used to complete the liquidation
6 of all obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously
7 granted under this head to enter into contracts.

8 CHAPTER IX

9 GENERAL PROVISIONS

10 SEC. 901. No part of any appropriation contained in
11 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
12 corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the
13 salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike
14 against the Government of the United States or who is a
15 member of an organization of Government employees that
16 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
17 United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an or-
18 ganization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
19 of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for
20 the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima
21 facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not
22 contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike
23 against the Government of the United States, is not a member
24 of an organization of Government employees that asserts the
25 right to strike against the Government of the United States,

1 or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
2 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
3 Government of the United States by force or violence: *Pro-*
4 *vided further*, That any person who engages in a strike
5 against the Government of the United States or who is a
6 member of an organization of Government employees that
7 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
8 United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an
9 organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Govern-
10 ment of the United States by force or violence and accepts
11 employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any
12 appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall
13 be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not
14 more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year,
15 or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause
16 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
17 provisions of existing law.

18 SEC. 902. This Act may be cited as the "Second Sup-
19 plemental Appropriation Act, 1953".

Passed the House of Representatives February 19, 1953.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 20, 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued Mar. 2, 1953

For actions of Feb. 26-27, 1953

3rd-1st, Nos. 33 and 34

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Adjourned.....4,10 | Forestry.....8,13 | Nomination.....3 |
| Appropriations.....6 | Hawaii Statehood.....11 | Personnel.....15,17,22 |
| Contracts.....14 | Housing.....1 | Price supports.....5 |
| Economic advisers.....6 | Inflation.....2,12 | Prices, farm.....5,20 |
| Electrification.....6,7,21 | Library service.....18 | Roads.....8 |
| Expenditures.....9 | Livestock.....5 | Rural telephone.....6 |
| Farm labor.....16 | Loans, farm.....5 | Trade, foreign.....19 |

HIGHLIGHTS: Sens. Bridges, Kerr, Humphrey et al discussed price supports, etc.
Senate committee reported supplemental appropriation bill.

HOUSE - February 26

1. HOUSING. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 27, to increase the loan-insurance authority of the Federal Housing Administration (p. 1497). This measure was identical with H. J. Res. 160, which had previously been passed by the House. The measure will now be sent to the President.
2. INFLATION. Rep. McCormack spoke in favor of standby authority for economic controls (p. 1500).
3. NOMINATION. Rep. Mumma spoke in favor of B. Frank Neitzelman for Governor of Alaska (p. 1496).
4. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 2 (p. 1502). Program for this week, as announced by Majority Whip Arends: Mon., consent calendar; Tues., private calendar; Wed. and Thurs., resolutions for committee investigations; a "bare possibility" is Hawaii statehood (p. 1497).

SENATE - February 27

5. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sens. Bridges, Kerr, Humphrey and others debated price supports and related matters. Sen. Bridges blamed the Truman administration for surpluses of farm products, said the "entire price support program has been mal-administered," defended flexible price-support levels, and expressed confidence in the Secretary and the farm economy. Sen. Kerr commended resolutions by a group of Okla. cattlemen favoring curtailment of beef imports, an emergency USDA credit program for livestock producers, removal of sales taxes on certain farm needs, a meat advertising program by the industry, and proclamation of 90%-of-parity price supports on beef. Sen. Humphrey spoke in favor of 90%-of-parity price

supports, emergency credit for cattle raisers, use of more meat in the school lunch program, and furnishing of meat and other agricultural commodities to the Koreans. (pp. 1534-5, 1538-43.)

6. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 3053 (S. Rept. 48)(p. 1508). The Committee agreed to an amendment, which had been received from the President earlier in the day, to transfer to the rural telephone program \$15,000,000 from the rural electrification loan authorization (S. Doc. 24)(p. 1506). Sen. Murray commended the President for requesting funds for the Council of Economic Advisers and inserted his correspondence with the President on the matter (pp. 1517-18). Sen. Taft announced that this bill is to be debated and acted upon today (p. 1523).
7. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Morse spoke in support of REA and public power (pp. 1548-50).
8. FOREST ROADS. Sen. Humphrey inserted a resolution from the commissioners of Lake County, Minn., favoring additional roads and bridges in the Superior National Forest (p. 1508).
9. EXPENDITURES. Sen. Carlson commended the President's expenditure-reduction policy (pp. 1535-7). Sen. Morse discussed various questions in connection with the budget and related matters (pp. 1551-3).
10. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 2 (p. 1553).

HOUSE - February 27

11. HAWAII STATEHOOD. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report the Hawaii statehood bill, H. R. 49, to the full committee (p. D103).

BILLS INTRODUCED

12. INFLATION. H. R. 3532, by Rep. Addonizio, to aid in controlling inflation; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 1502).
13. FORESTRY. H. R. 3535, by Rep. Ellsworth, to prevent Federal acquisitions of land from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 1502).
14. CONTRACTS. H. R. 3539, by Rep. Heselton, to repeal Sec. 10 of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act; to Judiciary Committee (p. 1502).
15. PERSONNEL. H. R. 3541, by Rep. Hosmer, to simplify and consolidate laws relating to dual compensation for U. S. employment; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 1502).
16. FARM LABOR. S. 1084, to continue the Mexican farm labor program; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 1509). Remarks of author (pp. 1510-13).
17. PERSONNEL. S. 1113, by Sen. Johnston, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 1509).

DRAFT OF A PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO
LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE

COMMUNICATION

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

DRAFT OF A PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO LOAN AUTHOR-
IZATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1953

FEBRUARY 27, 1953.—Read; referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and
ordered to be printed

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 26, 1953.

T The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to loan authorizations of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1953.

The details of this proposed provision, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for its submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

2 PROVISION PERTAINING TO LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS—AGRICULTURE

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington 25, D. C., February 25, 1953.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to loan authorizations of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1953, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION
LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

The basic amount authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury for the rural electrification program is decreased from "\$50,000,000" to "\$35,000,000," and the basic amount authorized by said act to be borrowed for the rural telephone program is increased from "\$25,000,000" to "\$40,000,000."

The purpose of this proposed provision is to authorize a transfer to the rural telephone program of \$15,000,000 from the rural electrification loan authorization. Funds for new telephone loans for 1953 have been exhausted, while funds for electrification loans are in excess of the amount needed for carrying out the current year's planned program.

I recommend that the foregoing proposed provision be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

JOS. M. DODGE,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

○

83D CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
{ No. 48

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

FEBRUARY 27, 1953.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3053]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

| | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Amount of bill as passed House..... | \$925, 172, 920 |
| Amount of increase by Senate committee..... | 22, 152, 659 |
| Amount of bill as reported to Senate..... | 947, 325, 579 |
| Total estimates considered by the Senate..... | ¹ 2, 327, 521, 114 |
| Amount of decrease recommended by Senate committee in budget estimates..... | 1, 380, 195, 535 |

¹ Includes \$13,801,524 in supplemental estimates submitted to the Senate subsequent to passage of the bill in the House.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

| Chapter | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in House bill | Amount recommended by Senate Committee | Increase (+) or decrease (-) Senate bill compared with— | |
|---------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------|
| | | | | | Estimates | House bill |
| I | Legislative and Judiciary..... | \$1,613,576 | \$942,920 | \$1,545,541 | -\$68,035 | +\$602,621 |
| II | State, Justice, and Commerce..... | 221,620,000 | 201,690,000 | 210,630,000 | -10,990,000 | +9,030,000 |
| III | Treasury..... | 2,300,000 | 750,000 | 750,000 | -1,550,000 | ----- |
| IV | Labor-Federal Security..... | 406,087,000 | 394,450,000 | 394,530,000 | -11,557,000 | +80,000 |
| V | Agriculture..... | (¹) | ----- | (¹) | ----- | ----- |
| VI | Interior..... | 870,000 | 396,000 | 396,000 | -474,000 | ----- |
| VII | Independent offices..... | 481,800,500 | 327,034,000 | 326,244,000 | -155,556,500 | -790,000 |
| VIII | Civil functions..... | (²) | (²) | (²) | ----- | ----- |
| IX | Defense..... | 1,200,000,000 | ----- | ----- | -1,200,000,000 | ----- |
| X | Judgments and authorized claims..... | 13,230,038 | ----- | 13,230,038 | ----- | +13,230,038 |
| | Total..... | 2,327,521,114 | 925,172,920 | 947,325,579 | -1,380,195,535 | +22,152,659 |

¹ Basic amount for Rural Electrification loans for 1953 decreased from \$50,000,000 to \$35,000,000 and for Rural Telephone loans increased from \$25,000,000 to \$40,000,000.

² Language changes only.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Total supplemental budget estimates for the Department of Defense contained in House Document 62 were for \$1,200,000,000. For the most part, the supplemental requests are caused by the continuation of the conflict in Korea and laws passed by the last Congress not foreseen when the original 1953 appropriation act was passed. Subsequent revisions and reductions of \$145,150,000 left a net adjusted requirement of \$1,054,850,000, not including \$1,000,000 required for claims and \$25,000,000 for retired pay for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for which provision was made in the House bill. Of this amount the House allowed \$1,043,724,000 by transfer among appropriation items. The remaining amount of \$11,126,000 for station allowances contained in the appropriation "Military personnel" in the Department of the Army was not allowed by the House.

The Senate concurs with the action of the House.

While the committee realizes that overseas station allowances must be continued at the presently established rates until officially changed, it is felt that some reductions should be made by the Per Diem Travel and Transportation Allowance Committee which will reduce the estimated requirements during the remainder of the fiscal year. Accordingly the committee has not provided the additional amount requested for this purpose.

Certain language changes permitting fiscal year 1951 unexpended funds to remain available during the fiscal year 1954 for the liquidation of obligations were recommended by the House and concurred in by the Senate committee.

INCREASES AND LIMITATIONS

Chapter I—Legislative Branch and Judiciary:

Senate:

Payment to the widow of Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut-----

\$12, 500

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators:

It is recommended by the committee that the following language providing an additional allowance for clerical assistants to each of the two Senators from the State of Florida be added to the bill:

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Florida, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than three million but less than five million, the population of said State having exceeded three million inhabitants.

Chapter I—Legislative Branch and Judiciary—Continued

Senate—Continued

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators—Continued

It is recommended by the committee that the following paragraph granting an additional allowance for clerical assistants to each of the Senators from the State of New Jersey be added to the bill:

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of New Jersey, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than five million but less than ten million, the population of said State having exceeded five million inhabitants.

Office of the Secretary:

The committee recommends that the following language providing for one camera and sound engineer, and one shipping clerk for the Joint Recording Facility be added to the bill:

Office of the Secretary: Effective March 1, 1953, the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953 is made available for the compensation of one camera and sound engineer, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of \$4,080 per annum, and one shipping clerk, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of \$1,500 per annum.

Joint Committee on Printing:

| | |
|--|----------|
| Salaries----- | \$555 |
| Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy: | |
| Salaries and expenses----- | 14, 000 |
| Vice President's automobile----- | 980 |
| Inquiries and investigations----- | 500, 000 |
| Total, Senate----- | 528, 035 |

House of Representatives:

Office of the Clerk:

Joint Recording Facility:

1 editor and laboratory supervisor at a basic rate of \$4,020 and 1 script writer and general secretary at a basic rate of \$2,500 effective Mar. 1, 1953-----

3, 835

Architect of the Capitol:

Capitol Buildings and Grounds:

Capitol Building-----

3, 651

For constructing brick arches under the main entrance portico steps of the Capitol Building \$2,851 and \$800 for closing by means of brickwork, plaster, and doors, two large arches in outer office of the Secretary of the Senate.

Chapter I—Legislative Branch and Judiciary—Continued**Architect of the Capitol—Continued****Capitol Buildings and Grounds—Continued**

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Senate Restaurant----- | \$1, 600 |
|------------------------|----------|

To provide improved sanitation in the Senate Restaurant, in accordance with recommendations made by the District of Columbia Health Department at the request of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Senate Office Building----- | 54, 000 |
|-----------------------------|---------|

To provide \$13,000 for new rugs; \$40,200 for air conditioning offices and committee rooms and other areas in the basement of the Senate Office Building, and \$800 for ventilation in coffee shop kitchen.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---------|
| Total, Architect of the Capitol----- | 59, 251 |
|--------------------------------------|---------|

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------|
| Total, legislative branch----- | 591, 121 |
|--------------------------------|----------|

The Judiciary:**Supreme Court of the United States:**

| | |
|---|---------|
| Preparation of rules for civil procedure----- | 11, 500 |
|---|---------|

| | |
|--|----------|
| Total, legislative branch and judiciary----- | 602, 621 |
|--|----------|

Chapter II—Department of Justice:

The committee recommends that the following language be included in the bill:

The Attorney General is hereby authorized to transfer from appropriations contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, not to exceed \$270,000 to the appropriation "Fees and expenses of witnesses, Justice", 1953, and not to exceed \$600,000 to the appropriation "Support of United States prisoners, Federal prison system", 1953.

The language will provide for the transfer of any available unobligated balances in the appropriations of the Department to these two appropriations in the amounts indicated. This procedure is recommended by the Department in order to provide savings by not appropriating additional funds for these purposes.

Department of Commerce:**Civil Aeronautics Administration:**

The committee considered a request for \$3,250,000 for the appropriation "Establishment of air navigation facilities." The House allowed \$2,500,000. The funds were requested to rehabilitate facilities on Wake Island. The committee has denied the request for an increase over the House bill. In approving an amount of \$2,500,000, the Department is instructed to revise its plans and provide for the air-navigation facilities and the necessary community facilities from the funds provided.

| | |
|--------------------|---------|
| Patent Office----- | 30, 000 |
|--------------------|---------|

The committee recommends a total appropriation of \$130,000 for the Patent Office to provide for increased costs for printing and reproduction at the Government Printing Office. Subsequent to action on this bill by the House committee, the Patent Office was advised by the Public Printer of an increase in prices which resulted in the increase of \$30,000 being necessary.

Department of Commerce—Continued**Bureau of Public Roads:**

Access roads (act of Sept. 7, 1950)----- \$10, 000, 000

The committee considered a budget estimate in the amount of \$23,000,000 including \$8,000,000 for liquidation of prior year contract authority. The House allowed the \$8,000,000 in liquidation cash on the advice of departmental officials that the balance or \$15,000,000 new program would be reviewed by the new officials of the Department. Subsequent to this review, the Department requested the committee to restore the entire \$15,000,000. The committee recommends that an additional \$10,000,000 be provided.

Total increases, chapter II----- 10, 030, 000

Chapter III—Treasury and Post Office:**Post Office Department:****Postal operations:**

The committee recommends that \$28,000,000 be added to the current appropriation of \$2,150,000,000 for "Postal operations." Such additional sum is to be derived by transfer of funds from the appropriation "Transportation of mails." Justifications indicated the additional sum is required because of the 3.9 percent increase in volume of mail than originally estimated, expansion of short-haul truck program, and holiday pay, for December 26, 1952, pursuant to Executive Order 10417A of December 6, 1952.

The committee recommends that the following language be inserted in the bill:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

POSTAL OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Postal operations", \$28,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953.

Claims:

The committee recommends that \$300,000 be added to the current appropriation of \$5,800,000 for "Claims." Such additional sum is to be derived by transfer of funds from the appropriation "Transportation of mails." Justifications presented to the committee showed there had been a 20-percent increase in volume and 32-percent increase in the average amount of damage claims settled by the Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The committee recommends that the following language be inserted in the bill:

CLAIMS

For an additional amount for "Claims", \$300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953.

Chapter IV—Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency:

Department of Labor:

Bureau of Employment Security:

Salaries and expenses-----\$80, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$80,000 for which it had an estimate in the amount of \$206,000, disallowed in its entirety by the House. These additional funds were requested for the purpose of performing its functions under title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, which provides for the payment of unemployment compensation to veterans. The act provided for the expenditure of any funds available under the grant program until such time as appropriations are made for this specific function. The committee was advised that in accordance with this provision of the act the Bureau has expended \$80,000, and the committee has provided this amount in this bill in order that the appropriation for grants to States may be adjusted, and instructs the Bureau to carry out these functions with funds presently available for salaries and expenses.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration:

The committee recommends no change in the House allowance, \$6,750,000, a reduction of \$2,000,000 below the estimate of \$8,750,000. The committee feels that this program has, in certain instances, been badly administered and urges both the Department and the State agencies involved to devote its attentions to this problem and make immediate improvements.

Federal Security Agency:

Office of Education:

Salaries and expenses:

The committee has disallowed the request for \$259,000, reduced from the budget estimate for \$289,000, as did the House. The funds were requested for the purpose of providing a staff and other necessary expenses to carry out certain functions under title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, which provides education and vocational assistance to veterans. In disallowing this item the committee has requested the Bureau of the Budget to review the request and to report its findings to the committee as soon as possible.

School construction----- (125, 000)

The committee recommends the following new paragraph:

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The amount made available under this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies, is increased from "\$750,000" to "\$875,000".

Chapter IV—Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency—Continued

Federal Security Agency—Continued

Office of Education—Continued

School construction—Continued

The purpose of this amendment is to authorize an increase in the limitation in the appropriation for school construction, Office of Education, in the Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1953, to cover additional expenses of the Housing and Home Finance Agency with respect to technical services rendered under Public Law 815. The amendment authorizes an increase in the limitation of \$125,000. This amount will permit such services to continue throughout fiscal year 1953.

Social Security Administration:

Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, salaries and expenses:

The committee has requested a review of this item by the Budget Director with a prompt report as to his recommendation.

National Mediation Board:

The committee recommends the following new paragraphs:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses", National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.

ARBITRATION AND EMERGENCY BOARDS

For an additional amount for "Arbitration and emergency boards", \$10,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses", National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in the National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1953, exclusively for compensation and expenses of referees is decreased from "\$216,000" to "\$199,000".

These proposed provisions are necessary to permit the agency to maintain mediation services during the last quarter of fiscal year 1953 and to appoint additional arbitration boards. The necessary funds for these transfers are available in the National Railroad Adjustment Board as a result of savings achieved by the recent abolition of two supplemental adjustment boards.

Chapter V—Department of Agriculture:**Rural Electrification Administration:**

The committee requests that the following chapter be added to the bill:

*CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE*

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

The basic amount authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury for the rural electrification program is decreased from "\$50,000,000" to "\$35,000,000," and the basic amount authorized by said Act to be borrowed for the rural telephone program is increased from "\$25,000,000" to "\$40,000,000".

The supplemental estimate (S. Doc. No. 24) states that funds for new telephone loans for 1953 have been exhausted, while funds for electrification loans are in excess of the amount needed for carrying out the current year's planned program. The committee is informed that this action will provide a total of \$50,476,000 in loans for the telephone program.

Chapter VI—Department of the Interior:**Office of the Secretary:**

Research in the utilization of saline water:

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$50,000 for this purpose. This is \$225,000 less than the estimate and the same amount as allowed by the House. The amount recommended is for contracts and grants with research institutions, educational institutions and private firms.

Chapter VII—Independent Offices:**Executive Office of the President:**

Council of Economic Advisers..... \$60, 000

The amount recommended by the committee is to cover salaries and expenses of the Council from March 31 to June 30, 1953, in lieu of the House action in adding \$25,000 to the White House Office for an economic adviser and staff. The estimate requested \$75,000.

The committee recommends that the following paragraph be added to the bill:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$60,000; and said appropriation shall remain available through June 30, 1953.

Emergency fund for the President, national defense---- 175, 000

The increase recommended by the committee is to provide a total of \$250,000 additional for the emergency fund, which is \$100,000 below the supplemental estimate of \$350,000.

Chapter VII—Independent Offices—Continued**Civil Service Commission:**

The committee approves the action of the House in providing a transfer of \$1,000,000 from "International information and educational activities" of the Department of State to the Civil Service Commission for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422, under which certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment, is made available to the Secretary General of the United Nations and the executive heads of other international organizations.

In this connection, the committee requests that copies of the results of such investigations, as well as a report on the action taken by such international organization, be filed with this committee.

Veterans' Administration:

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services:

The committee has requested a review of this item by the Budget Director, with a prompt report as to his recommendation:

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Total increases, chapter VII----- | \$235, 000 |
| Chapter X—Judgments and authorized claims----- | 13, 230, 038 |
| Total increase----- | 24, 177, 659 |

DECREASES AND LIMITATIONS**Chapter II—Department of State:****International Boundary and Water Commission,
United States and Mexico-----**

1, 000, 000

The House recommended an appropriation of \$2,500,000 to provide additional funds to meet contractors' earnings on Falcon Dam being constructed on the Rio Grande between the United States and Mexico. The committee was advised by the Department of State that after a preliminary analysis of the projected budgetary position of the Department, it would be feasible and appropriate to transfer \$1,000,000 from the appropriation "International information and educational activities, 1953" to the appropriation for the construction of this dam. The committee recommends that this be done which results in a decrease of \$1,000,000 in the bill.

Chapter VIII—Independent Offices:**Executive Office of the President:**

The White House Office----- \$25,000

The decrease recommended by the committee conforms to the action recommended in restoring \$60,000 of the \$75,000 estimate to the Council of Economic Advisers.

The committee recommends that the following be stricken from the bill:

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE**SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, \$25,000.

Veterans' Administration:

Grants to the Republic of the Philippines----- 1, 000, 000

The committee recommends that the paragraph be stricken from the bill, as follows:

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For an additional amount for "Grants to the Republic of the Philippines", \$1,000,000.

The committee has requested a review of the item by the Budget Director, with a prompt report as to his recommendation.

Total decreases----- 2, 025, 000

RECAPITULATION

Total increases by Senate committee----- 24, 177, 659

Total decreases by Senate committee----- 2, 025, 000

Net increase----- 22, 152, 659

Amount of bill as passed House----- 925, 172, 920

Net increase----- 22, 152, 659

Amount of bill as reported to Senate----- 947, 325, 579

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in House bill | Amount recom- mended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with | |
|--------------------------|---|-----------|------------------------------|--|--|-------------|
| | | | | | Estimates | House bill |
| LEGISLATIVE BRANCH | | | | | | |
| SENATE | | | | | | |
| S. Doc. 16 | Payment to the widow of late Senator Brien McMahon of the State of Con- necticut----- | | | \$12, 500 | + \$12, 500 | + \$12, 500 |
| | Joint Committee on Printing----- | \$555 | | 555 | | + 555 |
| | Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy----- | | | 14, 000 | + 14, 000 | + 14, 000 |
| S. Doc. 16 | Vice President's automobile----- | 980 | | 980 | | + 980 |
| S. Doc. 16 | Inquiries and Investigations----- | 500, 000 | | 500, 000 | | + 500, 000 |
| | Total, Senate----- | 501, 535 | | 528, 035 | + 26, 500 | + 528, 035 |
| HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | | | | | | |
| | Beneficiaries of deceased members----- | | \$37, 500 | 37, 500 | + 37, 500 | |
| | Office of the Clerk----- | | | 3, 835 | + 3, 835 | + 3, 835 |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE | | | | | |
| 87 | Furniture----- | 58,750 | 58,750 | 58,750 | ----- |
| 87 | Special and select committees----- | 600,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | --100,000 |
| 87 | Stationery (revolving fund)----- | 800 | 800 | 800 | ----- |
| | Total, House of Representatives----- | 659,550 | 597,050 | 600,885 | +3,835 |
| CAPITOL POLICE | | | | | |
| 87 | Capitol Police Board----- | 670 | ----- | ----- | --670 |
| EDUCATION OF SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES | | | | | |
| 87 | Education of Senate, House, and Supreme Court pages----- | 2,570 | 2,570 | 2,570 | ----- |
| ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL | | | | | |
| CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS | | | | | |
| | Capitol Buildings----- | 2,851 | ----- | 3,651 | +3,651 |
| | Senate Restaurant----- | 1,600 | ----- | 1,600 | +1,600 |
| | Senate Office Building----- | 54,000 | ----- | 54,000 | +54,000 |
| | Total, Architect of the Capitol----- | 58,451 | ----- | 59,251 | +59,251 |
| | Total, Legislative Branch----- | 1,222,776 | 599,620 | 1,190,741 | +591,121 |

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill—Con.

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in House bill | Amount recom- mended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with | |
|---------------------------|--|-------------|------------------------------|--|--|--------------|
| | | | | | Estimates | House bill |
| THE JUDICIARY | | | | | | |
| OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES | | | | | | |
| S. Doc 23 | Supreme Court, preparation of rules for civil procedure----- | \$11, 500 | ----- | \$11, 500 | ----- | +\$11, 500 |
| 62 | Fees of commissioners----- | 107, 000 | \$107, 000 | 107, 000 | ----- | ----- |
| 62 | Fees of jurors----- | 200, 000 | 200, 000 | 200, 000 | ----- | ----- |
| 62 | Miscellaneous salaries----- | 39, 100 | 20, 600 | 20, 600 | -\$18, 500 | ----- |
| 62 | Travel expenses----- | 17, 500 | ----- | ----- | -17, 500 | ----- |
| 62 | Salaries of court reporters----- | 15, 700 | 15, 700 | 15, 700 | ----- | ----- |
| 62 | Salaries of referees (special account)----- | (134, 000) | (134, 000) | (134, 000) | ----- | ----- |
| | Total, the judiciary----- | 390, 800 | 343, 300 | 354, 800 | -36, 000 | +11, 500 |
| | Total, ch. I----- | 1, 613, 576 | 942, 920 | 1, 545, 541 | -68, 035 | +602, 621 |
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE | | | | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses----- | 360, 000 | ----- | ----- | -360, 000 | ----- |
| 62 | International Boundary and Water Com- mission, United States and Mexico: Construction----- | 2, 500, 000 | 2, 500, 000 | 1 1, 500, 000 | -1, 000, 000 | -1, 000, 000 |
| | Total, Department of State----- | 2, 860, 000 | 2, 500, 000 | 1, 500, 000 | -1, 360, 000 | -1, 000, 000 |

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-------------|-------|-----|-------|--------------|-------|
| 62 | Fees and expenses of witnesses----- | 200, 000 | ----- | (2) | ----- | -200, 000 | ----- |
| | IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE | | | | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses----- | 1, 725, 000 | ----- | | | -1, 725, 000 | ----- |
| | FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM | | | | | | |
| 62 | Support of United States prisoners----- | 600, 000 | ----- | (2) | | -600, 000 | ----- |
| | Total, Department of Justice----- | 2, 525, 000 | ----- | | | -2, 525, 000 | ----- |

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-------------|-------------|--|-------------|--------------|-------|
| 62 | Establishment of air-navigation facilities----- | 4, 600, 000 | 2, 500, 000 | | 2, 500, 000 | -2, 100, 000 | ----- |
| 62 | Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act----- | 3, 500, 000 | 3, 500, 000 | | 3, 500, 000 | | ----- |

PATENT OFFICE

| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------|----------|----------|--|----------|---------|----------|
| 62 | Salaries and expenses----- | 135, 000 | 100, 000 | | 130, 000 | -5, 000 | +30, 000 |
|----|----------------------------|----------|----------|--|----------|---------|----------|

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|--|-------|
| 62 | Federal-aid highways----- | 185, 000, 000 | 185, 000, 000 | | 185, 000, 000 | | ----- |
|----|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|--|-------|

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------|-------------|--|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| 62 | Access roads (act of Sept. 7, 1950)----- | 23, 000, 000 | 8, 000, 000 | | 18, 000, 000 | -5, 000, 000 | +10, 000, 000 |
|----|--|--------------|-------------|--|--------------|--------------|---------------|

Total, Department of Commerce-----

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | | 216, 235, 000 | 199, 100, 000 | | 209, 130, 000 | -7, 105, 000 | +10, 030, 000 |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|--------------|---------------|

Total, ch. II-----

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| | | 221, 620, 000 | 201, 600, 000 | | 210, 630, 000 | -10, 990, 000 | +9, 030, 000 |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|--|---------------|---------------|--------------|

See footnotes at end of table, p. 21.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill—Con.

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in House bill | Amount recom- mended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with | |
|----------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | | | Estimates | House bill |
| 62 | TREASURY DEPARTMENT | | | | | |
| | Bureau of the Public Debt----- | \$2, 300, 000 | \$750, 000 | \$750, 000 | -\$1, 550, 000 | |
| S. Doc. 20 | POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT | | | | | |
| | Postal operations----- | ³ (28, 000, 000) | | ³ (28, 000, 000) | | ³ + (\$28, 000, 000) |
| S. Doc. 20 | Claims----- | ³ (300, 000) | | ³ (300, 000) | | ³ + (300, 000) |
| | Total, ch. III----- | 2, 300, 000 | 750, 000 | 750, 000 | -1, 550, 000 | |
| 62 | DEPARTMENT OF LABOR | | | | | |
| | BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY | | | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses----- | 206, 000 | | 80, 000 | -126, 000 | +80, 000 |
| | Grants to States for unemployment com- pensation and employment service ad- ministration----- | 8, 750, 000 | 6, 750, 000 | 6, 750, 000 | -2, 000, 000 | |
| 62 | Unemployment compensation for veterans-- | 32, 200, 000 | 27, 200, 000 | 27, 200, 000 | -5, 000, 000 | |
| | BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS | | | | | |
| | Salaries and expenses----- | ³ (150, 000) | ³ (150, 000) | ³ (150, 000) | | |
| | Total, Department of Labor----- | 41, 156, 000 | 33, 950, 000 | 34, 030, 000 | -7, 126, 000 | +80, 000 |

| FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| OFFICE OF EDUCATION | | | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses----- | 289, 000 | ----- | ----- | -289, 000 |
| 62 | Payments to school districts----- | 24, 000, 000 | 20, 500, 000 | ----- | -3, 500, 000 |
| 62 | School construction----- | ⁴ (1, 250, 000) | ----- | ⁴ (125, 000) | ⁴ - (1, 125, 000) |
| PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE | | | | | |
| 62 | Hospitals and medical care----- | 642, 000 | ----- | ----- | -642, 000 |
| SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance----- | ⁵ (4, 360, 000) | ⁵ (2, 000, 000) | ----- | ⁵ - (2, 360, 000) |
| 62 | Grants to States for public assistance----- | 340, 000, 000 | 340, 000, 000 | ----- | ----- |
| | Total, Federal Security Agency----- | 364, 931, 000 | 360, 500, 000 | ----- | -4, 431, 000 |
| NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD | | | | | |
| S. Doc. 21 | Salaries and expenses----- | ³ (7, 000) | ----- | ³ (7, 000) | ³ + (7, 000) |
| S. Doc. 21 | Arbitration and Emergency Boards----- | ³ (10, 000) | ----- | ³ (10, 000) | ³ + (10, 000) |
| | Total, ch. IV----- | 406, 087, 000 | 394, 450, 000 | ----- | -11, 557, 000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | | | | |
| S. Doc. 24 | Rural Electrification Administration, loan authorization, rural telephones----- | ⁶ (15, 000, 000) | ----- | ⁶ (15, 000, 000) | ⁶ + (15, 000, 000) |

See footnotes at end of table, p. 21.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill—Con.

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in House bill | Amount recom- mended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with | |
|----------------|---|------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|
| | | | | | Estimates | House bill |
| | DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR | | | | | |
| | OFFICE OF SECRETARY | | | | | |
| 62 | Research in the utilization of saline water-- | \$275, 000 | \$50, 000 | \$50, 000 | -\$225, 000 | ----- |
| | BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT | | | | | |
| 62 | Management of lands and resources----- | 100, 000 | 60, 000 | 60, 000 | -40, 000 | ----- |
| | BUREAU OF MINES | | | | | |
| 62 | Health and safety----- | 475, 000 | 266, 000 | 266, 000 | -209, 000 | ----- |
| | Total, Department of Interior----- | 850, 000 | 376, 000 | 376, 000 | -474, 000 | ----- |
| | FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW | | | | | |
| 62 | Salaries and expenses----- | 20, 000 | 20, 000 | 20, 000 | | ----- |
| | Total, ch. V----- | 870, 000 | 396, 000 | 396, 000 | -474, 000 | ----- |
| | EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT | | | | | |
| | The White House Office----- | | 25, 000 | | | -\$25, 000 |
| 62 | Emergency fund for the President (national defense)----- | 350, 000 | 75, 000 | 250, 000 | -100, 000 | +175, 000 |
| 62 | Council of Economic Advisers----- | 75, 000 | | 60, 000 | -15, 000 | +60, 000 |

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

| CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 66 | Investigations of United States citizens for employment by international organizations----- | 1, 000, 000 | (7) | (7) | -1, 000, 000 |
| 62 | Tennessee Valley Authority----- | (8) | (9) | (9) | ----- |
| VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| 62 | Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services----- | 18, 960, 000 | 10, 000, 000 | 10, 000, 000 | -8, 960, 000 |
| 62 | Compensation and pensions----- | 237, 573, 000 | 237, 573, 000 | 237, 573, 000 | ----- |
| 62 | Readjustment benefits----- | 206, 058, 000 | 75, 000, 000 | 75, 000, 000 | -131, 058, 000 |
| 62 | Servicemen's indemnities----- | 2, 500, 000 | 2, 000, 000 | 2, 000, 000 | -500, 000 |
| 62 | Veterans' miscellaneous benefits----- | 1, 361, 000 | 1, 361, 000 | 1, 361, 000 | ----- |
| 62 | Grants to the Republic of the Philippines----- | 1, 423, 500 | 1, 000, 000 | ----- | ----- |
| | Total, Veterans' Administration----- | 467, 875, 500 | 326, 934, 000 | 325, 934, 000 | -1, 423, 500 |
| HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY | | | | | |
| 62 | Office of the Administrator: Defense housing----- | 12, 500, 000 | (10) | (10) | -12, 500, 000 |
| 62 | Public Housing Administration----- | 11 (1, 350, 000) | (10) | (10) | 11 (-1, 350, 000) |
| | Total, ch. VII----- | 481, 800, 500 | 327, 034, 000 | 326, 244, 000 | -155, 556, 500 |
| | | | | | -790, 000 |

SUMMARY TABLE SHOWING TOTAL REDUCTION RESULTING FROM ACTION RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Reduction in budget estimates----- | \$154, 766, 500 |
| Rescission of \$1,000,000 of the appropriation for "Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief," Veterans' Administration----- | 1, 000, 000 |
| Total reduction recommended----- | 155, 766, 500 |

See footnotes at end of table, p. 21.

Comparative statement of amounts of the budget estimates and of amounts recommended to be appropriated by the bill—Con.

| H. Doc. No. | Department or agency | Estimates | Recommended in House bill | Amount recom- mended by Senate committee | Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with | |
|----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--|--|------------|
| | | | | | Estimates | House bill |
| | CIVIL FUNCTIONS | | | | | |
| | DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY | | | | | |
| 62 | Canal Zone Government----- | (12) | (12) | (12) | | |
| 62 | Panama Canal Company----- | 13 (\$278, 200) | 13 (\$255, 200) | 13 (\$255, 200) | 13 -- (\$23, 000) | |
| | Total, ch. VIII----- | 13 (278, 200) | 13 (255, 200) | 13 (255, 200) | 13 (23, 000) | |
| | DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE | | | | | |
| 62 | MILITARY FUNCTIONS | | | | | |
| | Office of the Secretary of Defense: | | | | | |
| | Claims----- | 1, 000, 000 | | | -1, 000, 000 | |
| | Retired pay----- | 25, 000, 000 | | | -25, 000, 000 | |
| | Department of the Army: | | | | | |
| | Military personnel, Army----- | 776, 300, 000 | | | -776, 300, 000 | |
| | Civilian relief in Korea----- | 11, 700, 000 | | | -11, 700, 000 | |
| | Department of the Navy: | | | | | |
| | Military personnel, Navy----- | 140, 000, 000 | | | -140, 000, 000 | |
| | Military personnel, Marine Corps----- | 63, 000, 000 | | | -63, 000, 000 | |

Department of the Air Force:

Military personnel requirements-----

Total, ch. IX-----

JUDGMENTS AND AUTHORIZED
CLAIMS

S. 19 Judgments and authorized claims, ch. X-----

Grand total-----

| | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-----|--|---------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | 183, 000, 000 | | | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| | 1, 200, 000, 000 | (4) | | (4) | | | ----- |
| | 13, 230, 038 | | | | 13, 230, 038 | | ----- |
| | 2, 327, 521, 114 | | | 925, 172, 920 | 947, 325, 579 | -1, 380, 195, 535 | + \$13, 230, 038 |
| | | | | | | | +22, 152, 659 |

¹ Plus \$1,000,000 to be derived by transfer from 1953 appropriation for International Information and Educational Activities.

² Transfers authorized from a available appropriations.

³ To be derived by transfer.

⁴ Increase in administrative expense limitation.

⁵ Increase in administrative expenses paid from trust fund.

⁶ Loan authorization.

⁷ \$1,000,000 made available by transfer from the appropriation "International information and educational activities, Department of State Appropriation Act, 1953."

⁸ Increase in limitation on travel from \$1,648,275 to \$2,000,000.

⁹ Increase in limitation on travel from \$1,648,275 to \$1,800,000.

¹⁰ Request withdrawn by letter from the agency on Feb. 2, 1953.

¹¹ Increase in limitation on nonadministrative expenses.

¹² Special language provision.

¹³ Increase in administrative expense limitation.

¹⁴ Language is included in the bill to permit transfers from currently available funds to the extent necessary to meet net adjusted requirements.

Department of Defense supplementals, 1953

[In thousands]

| Agency and item | Adjusted net request for appropriations | | Proposed transfers to meet net adjusted request | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| | H. Doc. 62 | Subsequent revisions and reductions | Net adjusted requirements | Savings based on scheduled obligations | Freeze order reductions | Other transfers |
| Office of the Secretary: | | | | | | |
| Claims----- | \$1, 000 | \$1, 000 | | | | |
| Retired pay----- | 25, 000 | 25, 000 | | | | |
| Total, Office of the Secretary----- | 26, 000 | 26, 000 | | | | |
| Department of the Army: | | | | | | |
| Military personnel----- | 776, 300 | 39, 450 | \$736, 850 | \$1, 500 | | \$1, 500 |
| Civilian relief in Korea----- | 14, 700 | 11, 700 | | 28, 750 | | 28, 750 |
| Maintenance and operations----- | | | | 50, 000 | \$51, 293 | \$200, 000 |
| Reserve personnel requirements, 1953----- | | | | 3, 057 | | 3, 057 |
| Reserve personnel requirements, 1952-53----- | | | | 8, 541 | | 8, 541 |
| Expansion of production facilities----- | | | | | 12, 000 | 87, 000 |
| Funds reserved by Air Force----- | | | | | | 295, 583 |
| Total, Department of the Army----- | 788, 000 | 51, 150 | 736, 850 | 91, 848 | 63, 293 | 570, 583 |
| Department of the Navy: | | | | | | |
| Military personnel, Navy----- | 140, 000 | | 140, 000 | | | 725, 724 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|
| Military personnel, Marine Corps----- | 63, 000 | ----- | 63, 000 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Navy personnel, general expenses----- | | | | 1, 850 | | | 1, 850 |
| Marine Corps, troops and facilities----- | | | | 40, 234 | | | 40, 234 |
| Ships and facilities----- | | | | 71, 439 | 11, 748 | | 83, 187 |
| Aircraft and facilities----- | | | | | 4, 921 | | 4, 921 |
| Ordnance and facilities----- | | | | 49, 202 | 8, 086 | | 57, 288 |
| Medical care----- | | | | 5, 763 | | | 5, 763 |
| Civil engineering----- | | | | 5, 722 | | | 5, 722 |
| Servicewide operations----- | | | | 2, 407 | | | 2, 407 |
| Officer candidate program, 1952-53----- | | | | 852 | | | 852 |
| Officer candidate program, 1953-54----- | | | | 776 | | | 776 |
| Total, Department of the Navy----- | 203, 000 | | 203, 000 | 178, 245 | 24, 755 | | 203, 000 |
| Department of the Air Force: | | | | | | | |
| Military personnel requirements----- | 183, 000 | 68, 000 | 115, 000 | | | | |
| Maintenance and operations----- | | | | 47, 463 | 67, 537 | | 115, 000 |
| Total, Department of the Air Force----- | 183, 000 | 68, 000 | 115, 000 | 47, 463 | 67, 537 | | 115, 000 |
| Grand total, Department of Defense----- | 1, 200, 000 | 145, 150 | 1, 054, 850 | 317, 556 | 155, 585 | 570, 583 | 1, 043, 724 |

¹ The difference of \$11,126,000 between this amount of \$1,043,724,000 and the net adjusted requirements of \$1,054,850,000 represents deletion by the committee of additional funds requested by the Army for station allowances.

83^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3053

[Report No. 48]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 20, 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

FEBRUARY 27, 1953

Reported by Mr. BRIDGES, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply sup-
5 plemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,
6 1953, and for other purposes, namely:

CHAPTER I

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

10 *For payment to Rosemary T. McMahon, widow of Brien*

1 *McMahon, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut,*
2 *\$12,500.*

3 *SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES*

4 *The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees*
5 *of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appro-*
6 *priation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of*
7 *additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State*
8 *of Florida, so that the allowance for administrative and*
9 *clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that*
10 *allowed other Senators from States having a population of*
11 *more than three million but less than five million, the popula-*
12 *tion of said State having exceeded three million inhabitants.*

13 *The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees*
14 *of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appro-*
15 *priation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment*
16 *of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the*
17 *State of New Jersey, so that the allowance for administrative*
18 *and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that*
19 *allowed other Senators from States having a population of*
20 *more than five million but less than ten million, the population*
21 *of said State having exceeded five million inhabitants.*

22 *Office of the Secretary: Effective March 1, 1953, the*
23 *appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the*
24 *Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation*
25 *Act for the fiscal year 1953 is made available for the com-*

1 *pensation of one camera and sound engineer, Joint Record-*
 2 *ing Facility, at the basic rate of \$4,080 per annum, and*
 3 *one shipping clerk, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic*
 4 *rate of \$1,500 per annum.*

5 *CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE*

6 *Joint Committee on Printing: For an additional amount*
 7 *for salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing, at rates to*
 8 *be fixed by the committee, \$555.*

9 *Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy*
 10 *For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Immi-*
 11 *gration and Nationality Policy, including the objects specified*
 12 *in section 401, Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress,*
 13 *second session, \$14,000; notwithstanding subsection (j) of*
 14 *section 401, amount to be disbursed by the Secretary of the*
 15 *Senate, upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the*
 16 *Joint Committee.*

17 *Vice President's automobile: For an additional amount*
 18 *for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation*
 19 *of an automobile for the Vice President, \$980.*

20 *Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount*
 21 *for "Expenses of inquiries and investigations", \$500,000.*

22 *HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*

23 *For payment to Ona Stigler, widow of William G.*
 24 *Stigler, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma,*
 25 *\$12,500.*

1 For payment to Mae Ruth Sabath, widow of Adolph
 2 J. Sabath, late a Representative from the State of Illinois,
 3 \$12,500.

4 For payment to Grace Hill Cox, widow of Eugene E.
 5 Cox, late a Representative from the State of Georgia,
 6 \$12,500.

7 *SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES*

8 *Office of the Clerk: For an additional amount for the*
 9 *"Office of the Clerk", \$3,835 to be available for the com-*
 10 *pensation of one editor and laboratory supervisor, effective*
 11 *March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of \$4,020 per annum, and*
 12 *one script writer and general secretary, effective March 1,*
 13 *1953, at a basic rate of \$2,500 per annum, Joint Recording*
 14 *Facility.*

15 *CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE*

16 Furniture: For an additional amount for "Furniture",
 17 \$58,750, to remain available until June 30, 1954, and the
 18 unexpended balance of the appropriation, "Contingent ex-
 19 penses, House of Representatives, furniture, 1952", is hereby
 20 made available until June 30, 1954.

21 Special and select committees: For an additional amount
 22 for salaries and expenses of special and select committees
 23 authorized by the House, \$500,000.

24 Stationery (revolving fund) : For an additional amount
 25 for "Stationery (revolving fund) ", for the first session of the

1 Eighty-third Congress, \$800, to remain available until
2 expended.

3 Automobiles for majority and minority leaders: Funds
4 appropriated for "Contingent expenses of the House" are
5 hereby made available for purchase, exchange, driving,
6 maintenance, repair, and operation of two automobiles, one
7 for the majority leader of the House, and one for the minority
8 leader of the House.

9 EDUCATION OF SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

10 For an additional amount for Education of Senate, House,
11 and Supreme Court pages, \$2,570.

12 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

13 CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS

14 *Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for "Capitol*
15 *Buildings" \$3,651, of which \$2,851 shall be for payment*
16 *to Skinker and Garrett, contractor, for constructing brick*
17 *arches under the main entrance portico steps of the Capitol*
18 *Building to support the 1953 Inaugural stands.*

19 *Senate Restaurant: For repairs, improvements, furnish-*
20 *ings and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Capitol Build-*
21 *ing, including personal and other services, \$1,600, to be*
22 *expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the super-*
23 *vision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration,*
24 *without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as*
25 *amended.*

1 *Senate Office Building: For an additional amount for*
2 *“Senate Office Building”, \$54,000.*

3 THE JUDICIARY

4 *SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES*

5 *PREPARATION OF RULES FOR CIVIL PROCEDURE*

6 *For expenses of the Supreme Court incident to proposed*
7 *amendments or additions to the rules of civil procedure for*
8 *the United States district courts pursuant to title 28,*
9 *United States Code, section 2072, to be expended as the*
10 *Chief Justice in his discretion may approve, including per-*
11 *sonal services in the District of Columbia, printing and*
12 *binding, and per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses*
13 *for subsistence at rates to be fixed by him not to exceed \$10*
14 *per day, \$11,500, to remain available until June 30, 1954.*

15 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

16 FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

17 For an additional amount for “Fees of commissioners”,
18 \$107,000.

19 FEES OF JURORS

20 For an additional amount for “Fees of jurors”, \$200,000.

21 MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

22 For an additional amount for “Miscellaneous salaries”,
23 \$20,600.

1 SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

2 For an additional amount for "Salaries of court re-
3 porters", \$15,700.

4 SALARIES OF REFEREES

5 For an additional amount for "Salaries of referees",
6 \$134,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall be avail-
7 able for payment of the salaries of referees at the increased
8 rates authorized by the Judicial Conference of the United
9 States in September 1952, effective as of October 1, 1952.

10 CHAPTER II

11 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

12 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,
13 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

14 CONSTRUCTION

15 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$2,500,-
16 000, to remain available until expended, *of which* \$1,000,000
17 *shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for*
18 *"International Information and Educational Activities",*
19 *Department of State Appropriation Act, 1953.*

20 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

21 *The Attorney General is hereby authorizd to transfer*
22 *from appropriations contained in the Department of Justice*
23 *Appropriation Act, 1953, not to exceed \$270,000 to the*
24 *appropriation "Fees and expenses of witnesses, Justice",*
25 *1953, and not to exceed \$600,000 to the appropriation "Sup-*

1 *port of United States prisoners, Federal prison system*’,
2 *1953.*

3 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

4 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

5 ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR-NAVIGATION FACILITIES

6 For an additional amount for “Establishment of air-
7 navigation facilities”, \$2,500,000, to remain available until
8 expended.

9 FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

10 For an additional amount for “Federal-aid airport pro-
11 gram, Federal Airport Act”, for liquidation of obligations
12 incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head
13 to enter into contracts, \$3,500,000, to remain available until
14 June 30, 1955.

15 PATENT OFFICE

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses”,
18 ~~\$100,000~~ \$130,000.

19 BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

20 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

21 For an additional amount for “Federal-aid highways”, to
22 remain available until expended, \$185,000,000, which sum
23 is composed of \$72,500,000, the remainder of the amount
24 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, and

1 \$112,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appro-
 2 priated for the fiscal year 1952.

3 ACCESS ROADS (ACT OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1950)

4 For an additional amount for "Access roads (Act of
 5 September 7, 1950)" for liquidation of obligations incurred
 6 pursuant to the contract authority granted by the Act of
 7 October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422), \$8,000,000, to remain
 8 available until expended, *to remain available until expended,*
 9 \$18,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obli-
 10 gations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted
 11 by the Act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422).

12 CHAPTER III

13 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

14 BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

15 ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

16 For an additional amount for "Administering the
 17 public debt", \$750,000.

18 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

19 (*Out of the postal revenues*)

20 POSTAL OPERATIONS

21 For an additional amount for "Postal operations",
 22 \$28,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropria-
 23 tion "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953.

1

CLAIMS

2

For an additional amount for "Claims", \$300,000, to
be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transporta-
tion of mails", fiscal year 1953.

5

CHAPTER IV

6

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

7

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

8

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
\$80,000.

11

GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

12

AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

13

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for
unemployment compensation and employment service ad-
ministration", \$6,750,000; and appropriations granted under
this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available for ex-
penses not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out
title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of
1952 (66 Stat. 684).

20

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS

21

For payments to unemployed veterans as authorized
by title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of
1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$27,200,000, to remain available un-
til June 30, 1954.

1 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
4 \$150,000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer
5 from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Economic
6 Stabilization Agency, 1953" and \$50,000 shall be derived
7 by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses,
8 Mexican Farm Labor Program, 1953", to remain available
9 until July 31, 1953: *Provided*, That these funds shall be
10 utilized solely for the continuation through June 1953 of a
11 consumer price index upon the same basis employed by the
12 Bureau of Labor Statistics in compiling such an index for
13 the period prior to January 1, 1953.

14 FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

15 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

16 PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

17 For an additional amount for "Payments to school
18 districts", \$20,500,000.

19 SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

20 *The amount made available under this head in the*
21 *Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, for necessary*
22 *expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies, is*
23 *increased from "\$750,000" to "\$875,000".*

1 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND

3 SURVIVORS INSURANCE

4 The amount authorized by the Federal Security Agency
5 Appropriation Act, 1953, to be expended from the Federal
6 old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, for "Salaries and
7 expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance", is
8 increased from "\$60,500,000" to "\$62,500,000".

9 GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

10 For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public
11 assistance", \$340,000,000.

12 NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 *For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",*
15 *\$7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation*
16 *"Salaries and expenses", National Railroad Adjustment*
17 *Board, fiscal year 1953.*

18 ARBITRATION AND EMERGENCY BOARDS

19 *For an additional amount for "Arbitration and emer-*
20 *gency boards", \$10,000, to be derived by transfer from the*
21 *appropriation "Salaries and expenses", National Railroad*
22 *Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.*

1 *NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD*2 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

3 *The amount made available under this head in the*
4 *National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1953,*
5 *exclusively for compensation and expenses of referees is*
6 *decreased from “\$216,000” to “\$199,000”.*

7 *CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE*8 *RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION*9 *LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS*

10 *The basic amount authorized by the Department of*
11 *Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, to be borrowed from*
12 *the Secretary of the Treasury for the rural electrification*
13 *program is decreased from “\$50,000,000” to “\$35,000,-*
14 *000,” and the basic amount authorized by said Act to be*
15 *borrowed for the rural telephone program is increased from*
16 *“\$25,000,000” to “\$40,000,000”.*

17 *CHAPTER V VI*18 *DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR*19 *OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY*20 *RESEARCH IN THE UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER*

21 *For an additional amount for “Research in the utiliza-*
22 *tion of saline water”, \$50,000.*

1 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

2 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

3 For an additional amount for "Management of lands and
4 resources", \$60,000.

5 BUREAU OF MINES

6 HEALTH AND SAFETY

7 For an additional amount for "Health and safety",
8 \$266,000; and appropriations granted under this head for
9 the fiscal year 1953 shall be available for the purchase of
10 fifty passenger motor vehicles in addition to those heretofore
11 provided.

12 FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF
13 REVIEW

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety
16 Board of Review, including services as authorized by section
17 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$20,000.

18 CHAPTER VI VII

19 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

20 THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
23 including employment without regard to the civil service
24 and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President
25 and a staff incidental thereto, \$25,000.

1 *COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS*2 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

3 *For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",*
4 *\$60,000; and said appropriation shall remain available*
5 *through June 30, 1953.*

6 **EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT**7 **NATIONAL DEFENSE**

8 For an additional amount for "Emergency fund for the
9 President, national defense", ~~\$75,000~~ *\$250,000*.

10 **INDEPENDENT OFFICES**11 **CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

12 **INVESTIGATIONS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOY-**
13 **MENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

14 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
15 Executive Order No. 10422, approved January 9, 1953,
16 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secre-
17 tary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads
18 of other international organizations, certain information con-
19 cerning United States citizens employed, or being considered
20 for employment by such organizations, \$1,000,000, to be
21 derived by transfer from the appropriation for "International
22 Information and Educational Activities", Department of
23 State Appropriation Act, 1953: *Provided*, That this ap-
24 propriation may be apportioned for use pursuant to Section
25 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, prior to April 1,

1 1953: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be
2 available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable
3 appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission
4 and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses in-
5 curred by such agencies under said Executive order.

6 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

7 The limitation under this head in the Independent Offices
8 Appropriation Act, 1953, as amended by the Supplemental
9 Appropriation Act, 1953, on the amount available for ex-
10 penses of travel, is hereby increased from “\$1,648,275” to
11 “\$1,800,000”.

12 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

13 ADMINISTRATION, MEDICAL, HOSPITAL, AND DOMICILIARY
14 SERVICES

15 For an additional amount for “Administration, medical,
16 hospital, and domiciliary services”, \$10,000,000.

17 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

18 For an additional amount for “Compensation and pen-
19 sions”, \$237,573,000, to remain available until expended.

20 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

21 For an additional amount for “Readjustment benefits”,
22 \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

23 SERVICEMEN’S INDEMNITIES

24 For an additional amount for “Servicemen’s indem-
25 nities”, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS' MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Veterans' miscellaneous benefits", \$1,361,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For an additional amount for "Grants to the Republic of the Philippines", \$1,000,000.

REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF

The appropriation heretofore granted for "Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief" is hereby reduced by the sum of \$1,000,000, and said amount shall be carried to the surplus of the Treasury.

CHAPTER ~~VII~~ VIII

CIVIL FUNCTIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

Not to exceed \$15,000 of the amount appropriated under this head in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953, for construction and major equipment, shall be available for payment to the Republic of Panama for an expansion of its Colon sewage disposal facilities to serve the Canal Zone.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

The amount made available under this head in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953, for general and

1 administrative expenses of the Panama Canal Company, is
2 hereby increased from “\$3,301,800” to “\$3,557,000”.

3 CHAPTER ~~VIII~~ IX

4 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

5 MILITARY FUNCTIONS

6 For additional amounts for the following appropriations
7 of not to exceed the amounts stated:

8 “Claims”, Department of Defense, \$1,000,000;

9 “Retired pay”, Department of Defense, \$25,000,000;

10 “Military personnel, Army”, \$725,724,000;

11 “Military personnel, Navy”, \$140,000,000;

12 “Military personnel, Marine Corps”, \$63,000,000;

13 “Military personnel requirements”, Department of the
14 Air Force, \$115,000,000; the foregoing amounts under this
15 heading to be derived by transfer from such appropriations
16 available to the Department of Defense for obligation during
17 the fiscal year 1953 as may be designated by the Secretary
18 of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau
19 of the Budget.

20 DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

21 MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

22 The unexpended balance of the appropriation “Marine
23 Corps troops and facilities, 1951” shall remain available
24 during the fiscal year 1954 for liquidation of obligations in-

1 curred thereunder for procurement of ordnance, ammunition,
2 and other military equipment.

3 SHIPS AND FACILITIES

4 The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Ships
5 and facilities, 1951" shall remain available during the fiscal
6 year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder
7 for procurement of electronics equipment.

8 ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

9 The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Ordnance
10 and facilities, 1951" shall remain available during the fiscal
11 year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder
12 for (1) production and procurement of Navy ordnance and
13 ammunition and (2) procurement of plant, equipment,
14 appliances, and machine tools.

15 DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

16 AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

17 Of the appropriation granted under this head in the
18 Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953,
19 \$1,685,044,000 shall be used to complete the liquidation
20 of all obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously
21 granted under this head to enter into contracts.

22 CHAPTER X

23 CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

24 For payment of claims for damages as settled and de-
25 termined by departments and agencies in accord with law,

1 *audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting*
2 *Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by*
3 *United States district courts and the United States Court of*
4 *Claims, as set forth in Senate Document Numbered 19,*
5 *Eighty-third Congress, \$13,230,038, together with such*
6 *amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when*
7 *specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of*
8 *the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such*
9 *additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may*
10 *be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: Provided,*
11 *That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until*
12 *it shall have become final and conclusive against the United*
13 *States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: Pro-*
14 *vided further, That, unless otherwise specifically required by*
15 *law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appro-*
16 *priated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty*
17 *days after the date of approval of this Act.*

18 CHAPTER ~~IX~~ XI

19 GENERAL PROVISIONS

20 SEC. ~~901~~ 1101. No part of any appropriation contained
21 in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
22 corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the
23 salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike
24 against the Government of the United States or who is a
25 member of an organization of Government employees that

1 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
2 United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an or-
3 ganization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
4 of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for
5 the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima
6 facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not
7 contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike
8 against the Government of the United States, is not a member
9 of an organization of Government employees that asserts the
10 right to strike against the Government of the United States,
11 or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
12 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
13 Government of the United States by force or violence: *Pro-*
14 *vided further*, That any person who engages in a strike
15 against the Government of the United States or who is a
16 member of an organization of Government employees that
17 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
18 United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an
19 organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Govern-
20 ment of the United States by force or violence and accepts
21 employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any
22 appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall
23 be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not
24 more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year,
25 or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause

1 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
2 provisions of existing law.

3 SEC. ~~902~~ 1102. This Act may be cited as the "Second
4 Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953".

Passed the House of Representatives February 19, 1953.

Attest:

LYLE O. SNADER,

Clerk.

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3053

[Report No. 48]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 20, 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

FEBRUARY 27, 1953

Reported with amendments

or to direct a sound foreign policy until employees disloyal to American principles are removed from the payroll.

Unfortunately, the startling evidence that has been published has been swallowed up in the political arena before the American people have had an opportunity to take a square look at it without political prejudice or distortion.

We therefore have a right to expect that men of integrity, loyalty, and honest purpose in both parties of the Congress will join together in the post-election period to demand that present investigations of the State Department be expedited with two basic objectives in mind:

1. To develop a practical program to re-establish American friendly relations and trade with Nationalist China and any other countries now closed to us where such moves are possible.

2. To recommend to the 83d Congress a basic foreign policy that the Congress can approve and will insist that all departments of Government carry out.

Further in this regard, that the 83d Congress charge the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with the serious responsibility of keeping the Congress advised of any failure on the part of any department of Government to carry out the will of the people as expressed by the Congress.

FOREST ROADS AND BRIDGES IN SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST— RESOLUTION OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, LAKE COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the county commissioners of Lake County, Minn., relating to forest roads and bridges in the Superior National Forest.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Government ownership in the Superior National Forest in Lake County as of June 30, 1952, comprises 703,731 acres, or more than 51 percent of Lake County; and

Whereas this area, which includes most of Lake County's valuable inland lakeshore property, is tax exempt; and

Whereas the acreage of Federal-owned land in the Superior National Forest is constantly increasing and county taxable area decreasing; and

Whereas Lake County is expending much more than its meager in-lieu-of-taxes return from the Superior National Forest for construction on the forest highway primary system; and

Whereas the funds allocated to the local forest administration for the maintenance of their own system of forest roads is totally inadequate; and

Whereas due to lack of funds for proper maintenance, the forest roads, portages, bridges, and buildings have depreciated to a deplorable and unsafe condition, and through no fault of the competent local forest administration; and

Whereas as a result, Lake County, a distressed county, has had to take over more forest roads into the county system and even provide for snow plowing of forest logging roads in order that children may be transported to school; and

Whereas Lake County cannot continue to be deprived of taxable value, and, at the same time, continue to assume additional responsibility and expend additional funds to relieve the Federal Government of its responsibility; and

Whereas this deplorable forest road, portage, and bridge condition can easily result in the wiping out of this vast region of natural resource in event of fire during a drought period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress be, and it hereby is, requested to provide yearly emergency funds to the extent of 10 times more than is now provided for the maintenance and reconditioning of the forest roads and bridges in the Superior National Forest and until said deplorable and disgraceful condition is corrected; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senator Edward J. Thye, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Congressman John A. Blatnik, and Galen W. Pike, forest supervisor, Superior National Forest.

PER CAPITA PAYMENT TO RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS— RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the General Council of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, relating to a per capita payment of \$50 to each member of that band of Indians.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the Red Lake Chippewas have much unemployment during the winter and spring months, and living expenses are higher during that period; and

Whereas many Indians need to have their homes repaired; and

Whereas the Red Lake Indians can use extra funds during the planting season: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the council representing the Red Lake Band hereby requests the Congress of the United States through the Honorable Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to enact and pass legislation to distribute \$50 of tribal funds to each member of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians in the spring of 1953, who are living on the date the act becomes law. This distribution of tribal funds shall be known as a per capita payment. The tribal funds to be used for this purpose shall be from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Indian Reservation or from any other tribal funds deposited to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; it is further

Resolved, That no money paid to Indians under this per capita act shall be subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or other persons, except the Red Lake Band of Chippewas; it is further

Resolved, That payments made under this act shall not be held to be "other income and resources" as that term is used in the Social Security Act as amended.

REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF BEDS AT FORT SNELLING HOSPITAL— RESOLUTION OF POST NO. 1172, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, EVELETH, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution unanimously adopted by VFW Post, No. 1172, Eveleth, Minn., at its regular meeting on February 2, 1953, protesting against the reduction in the number of beds at the Fort Snelling Hospital, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas many sick and wounded veterans are returning daily from Korea, and many of the older veterans of World Wars I and II are needing medical care; and

Whereas veterans' hospitals are now crowded to the point where it is difficult for a sick veteran to get immediate hospitalization; and

Whereas the news has reached this post that the Veterans' Administration is contemplating reducing the number of beds at the Fort Snelling Hospital by 100, or more: therefore be it

Resolved, That this post protests the above action, and petitions you to do all in your power to prevent any further reduction in veterans' hospital facilities, and be it further

Resolved, That efforts be made to increase the number of beds available at Fort Snelling by using the old wing of the infirmary as well as the new wing; and, be it finally

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to honorable Senators HUMPHREY, THYE, and Congressman JOHN BLATNIK.

EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF THE FERNWOOD GRANGE 770, NEWBERG, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Fernwood Grange 770, Newberg, Oreg., be printed in the RECORD. The resolution asks that social security be extended to cover all farmers and professional men.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the present Social Security Act does not cover the farmers and certain professional men: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fernwood Grange, No. 770, of Yamhill County goes on record as favoring the extension of social security to cover all farmers and professional men.

A copy of this resolution to be mailed to the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD and Senators WAYNE MORSE and GUY CORDON.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 48) thereon. I hope we will be able to take action on the bill early next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 86), which, under the rule, was referred to the Com-

is possible without participation of that part of Europe which comprises a force of over 100 million people separated from the rest of the world by the Iron Curtain; and

"Whereas the mere denial to recognize the Soviet claims of that area, when not accompanied by any positive action on the part of the United States to back its stand, do not and will not bear the slightest effect on the Kremlin masters: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, patriotic American citizens of Lithuanian descent, concerned about security and prosperity of this great country and over the fate of our native land, Lithuania, now under brutal Soviet yoke, appeal to the Government of the United States—

"1. To adopt a clear and firm foreign policy such as America's leading role in the world affairs necessitates.

"2. To incorporate the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet-enslaved countries, as an integral and inseparable part, in the program of the United States foreign policy.

"3. To inaugurate all suitable means to aid liberation movements in the Soviet-enslaved countries and to enlist their cooperation in the global efforts to fight international communism.

"4. To speed ratification of the Genocide Convention and to implement the ratification by a decisive action within the United Nations to make Soviet Russia responsible for the crimes committed in the Baltic States and other countries behind the Iron Curtain; be it further

Resolved, That this meeting pledge all possible support of the Lithuanian Americans to the Federal Government in its efforts to resist the evil Communist forces of aggression and to sustain peace and freedom everywhere; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Maryland Members of both Houses of Congress, the United States representatives in the United Nations, the Governor of the State of Maryland, the mayor of Baltimore City, the diplomatic and consular representatives of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the United States, and the press."

ANTHONY J. MICEIKA,
President.
MATAS BRAZAUSKAS,
Secretary.

COLLECTION OF FEDERAL GASOLINE TAXES BY THE STATES—RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF INDIANA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing Congress to enact legislation to repeal Federal laws requiring States to collect and turn over to the Federal Government gasoline taxes.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution to memorialize Congress to enact legislation to repeal Federal laws requiring States to collect and turn over to the Federal Government gasoline taxes

Whereas the State of Indiana, by virtue of the laws heretofore enacted by the United States Congress collects a tax on each gallon of gasoline sold in the State of Indiana; and

Whereas each year in compliance with said Federal laws, the State of Indiana, as well as many other States, sends millions of dollars more to the Federal Government, than it receives from the Federal Government for highway purposes; and

Whereas the highway systems of many States, including Indiana are in such a critical condition as to make it necessary that all taxes collected by the States for highway purposes be retained by the States and used for the purposes for which they are collected: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana:

SECTION 1. This, the 88th session of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States of America to enact appropriate legislation repealing laws which require the States to collect and send to said Government the tax on gasoline.

SEC. 2. The secretary of the senate shall send a certified copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana.

EVACUATION OF RUSSIAN TROOPS FROM LITHUANIA—RESOLUTION OF LITHUANIAN AID ASSOCIATION, WORCESTER, MASS.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at a mass meeting held under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Association, at the hall of the Lithuanian Naturalization Club, Worcester, Mass., relating to the evacuation of Russian troops from Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a mass meeting held under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Association, at the hall of the Lithuanian Naturalization Club, Worcester, Mass., the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas Russia, by force of arms and in utter violation of all legal and moral laws, continues to occupy the territory of the Republic of Lithuania; to deport, imprison, and exterminate Lithuania's Nationals, to commit atrocities against the civil population of Lithuania; to systematically destroy Lithuania's democratic form of government: Be it

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's such unlawful by force of arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania, against the deportation, imprisonment, and extermination of Lithuania's Nationals, against the commission of atrocities against the civil population and against the systematic destruction of Lithuania's democratic form of government; be it further

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., most fervently petition the President of the United States of America, to use to the utmost the influence of the Government of the United States of America, to the end that all Russian military forces and Government be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania, and Lithuania and her people be restored as a free and independent Republic among the nations of the world according to the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State, the Senators and Congressmen of the United States from Massachusetts, and to the United Nations."

M. ZEMAITAITIS,
Chairman.
J. PALUBECKAS,
Secretary.

THE KOREAN PROBLEM—PETITION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, nothing so well evidences the interest of the American people in the Korean problem and in the question of subversion and doubtful loyalty within the structure of government than the avidity with which more than 4,000 people have signed a petition addressed to the President and Members of the 83d Congress. The petition has been circulated by the Rockford Chamber of Commerce as a matter of public service and they have enrolled literally thousands of signatures. I believe it quite worthwhile to have the petition printed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done, and that it may be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION AND PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE MEMBERS OF THE 83D CONGRESS, OCTOBER 18, 1952

American families are concerned about the position in which we find ourselves in Korea. Their concern grows out of their inability to determine in their own minds what is the right thing to do.

Throughout the history of our country, parents and America's young men have courageously made great sacrifices to obtain or defend our freedom.

The United States Armed Forces have fought victoriously in all corners of the world. They have been sure they were fighting for the freedom of themselves and their fellow countrymen, defending their homes, or preserving the freedom of citizens of an allied country—and always with the clear understanding that their efforts were in support of established fundamental American concepts that peace and individual freedom are the divine rights of man.

Today there is a deep-seated conviction on the part of a large number of our people that we are operating without a clear-cut foreign policy. It may be that Congress knows what our basic foreign policy is. It may be that some folks in the State Department know what it is, but it is obviously not clear to the American public. Further, it is increasingly clear to a great many that there are those in the State Department who by action and belief support the philosophies, ideologies, or the actions of Soviet Russia and her satellites in preference to the fundamental principles that we of America stand for.

Proof of the foregoing statement is supported by findings and recommendations of congressional committees and has been conclusively presented in sworn testimony before congressional committees, by competent Government officials and military leaders and by citizens well informed through personal experience on the problems of the Far East in particular.

It is clear from the testimonies mentioned above that men who follow the philosophies of Soviet Russia have been promoted or sheltered in the State Department.

China was a loyal and active Ally during World War II. We have enjoyed a friendly relationship with the Chinese people for generations. Today China is closed to Americans and American trade for the first time since the Boxer Rebellion. This has happened under the leadership of our present State Department officials. Sworn testimony before congressional committees and findings of these committees make it tragically clear that our State Department policies aided the Communists in taking over control of all China.

We can no longer depend upon the State Department to give us the unbiased truth

Mr. LANGER. I should like to have the same privilege with regard to meetings of the Committee on the Judiciary.

On request of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a change made in the sentence in the second column on page 1439 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25. The sentence now reads:

However, in line with what seem to me to be sound suggestions which have been made by some who have commented about S. 1026, this new bill contains a provision outlawing strikes and lockouts in vital industries for a maximum period of 60 days after the issuance of a proclamation by the President declaring that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a strike or lockout has resulted or threatens to result from such labor dispute.

I ask that the sentence be changed to read as follows:

However, in line with what seem to me to be sound suggestions which have been made by some who have commented about S. 1026, this new bill contains a provision outlawing strikes and lockouts in vital industries for a maximum period of 60 days after the appointment of an emergency board by the President following his proclamation declaring that a national emergency is threatened or exists because a strike or lockout has resulted or threatens to result from such labor dispute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 20)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations for the Post Office Department, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS, NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD (S. Doc. No. 21)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations for the fiscal year 1953, for the National Mediation Board (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. Doc. No. 22)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, in the amount of \$53,451, for the legislative branch, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, THE JUDICIARY (S. Doc. No. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of \$11,500, for the judiciary, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 24)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to loan authorizations of the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF VIOLATION OF SECTION 3679, REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATION IN EXCESS OF ALLOTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the expenditure of an appropriation in excess of allotment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY LAWS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to restore certain provisions of law affected by the act entitled "An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 701) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF, EXPENDITURES BY, AND DONATIONS TO BUREAU OF MINES ANTHRACITE RESEARCH LABORATORY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines Anthracite Research Laboratory, Schuylkill Haven, Pa., for the calendar year 1952; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION OF LIST OF POSITIONS NOT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE

A letter from the Executive Director, United States Civil Service Commission, informing the Senate, that in the letter of the Commission dated February 20, 1953, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 19, the lists of positions not under civil service rules and regulations, the Commission inadvertently failed to state that the lists do not include certain Department of Defense positions which were not reported to them because of security considerations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the West Palm Beach (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 1, favoring the substitution of the so-called Townsend plan for old-age pensions for the present

social-security program; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for a revision of the so-called McCarran immigration law relating to the treatment of merchant seamen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Council of American Master Mariners, New York, N. Y., signed by Thomas Sheridan, secretary-treasurer, remonstrating against the construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Legislative Resolution 6

"Whereas the various States have enacted primary election laws that vary in the method of obtaining an advisory vote on presidential candidates; and

"Whereas it would be more representative of the people if the advisory vote obtained before the national conventions was uniform: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-fifth session assembled:

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact a law establishing a uniform election procedure for obtaining an advisory vote for presidential candidates.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

"CHARLES J. WARNER,
"President of the Legislature."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Council of Lithuanian Societies, Baltimore, Md., at recent ceremonies marking the 35th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, citizens of the United States of Lithuanian descent of the city of Baltimore, Md., in commemoration of the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the people of Lithuania, held on the 16th day of February 1953, at the Lithuanian Auditorium, 851 Hollins Street, sponsored by the Council of Lithuanian Societies, unanimously adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas in the eyes of people around the world, the United States has been the strongest champion of the oppressed; and

"Whereas the traditional American leadership in principles of justice, morality, and equal rights to all human beings on the earth paved the way for the American supremacy in the political, military, and economic world affairs which this country is today providing for the benefit of mankind; and

"Whereas intolerable conditions which now prevail in Eastern and Central Europe, including Lithuania and other Baltic States, should be of greatest concern to the United States as no peace and stability in the world



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 99

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1953

No. 34

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 2, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

Senate

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God our Father, whom we seek in all our need and through all the mystery and perplexity of life, without whom we cannot live bravely or well: Show us Thy will in all the maze of paths our uncertain feet may take. As we draw near to Thee now in prayer at the beginning of this session, do Thou graciously draw near unto us, until we become more sure of Thee than of midday light. Come to us in the common life that entangles us. Meet us in the thorny questions, national and international, which confront us. Make Thy highways through the avenues of sense clothe Thy glory in our failing and fallible judgments.

"Breathe on us, breath of God,
Until our hearts are pure,
Until, with Thee, we will one will
To do and to endure."

Amen:

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 25, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had

passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2332) to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. ALBERTO ARISPE, SENATOR IN THE CONGRESS OF PERU

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] wishes to present a visitor to the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may present to the Senate a distinguished visitor from a South American country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Iowa may proceed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Last August I was the beneficiary of very great hospitality on the part of the Legislature of Peru. At that time I became acquainted with a gentleman whose kindness to me I appreciate, and who is now present on a good-will visit to the United States. It affords me great pleasure to present to the Senate the Honorable Alberto Arispe, a Senator in the Congress of Peru from the Department of Arequipa. [Applause, Senators rising.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TOBEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate

from Monday, March 2, 1953, to Tuesday, March 17, 1953.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the members of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate this afternoon, and that they may meet during the Senate session today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in asking that the members of his subcommittee may be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today, the Senator from North Dakota should realize that if there is a rollcall, they will have to attend the Senate session.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is correct in his statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in order to expedite the work of the Appropriations Committee in the remaining months of the present session of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to meet when necessary during the sessions of the Senate. Such permission will not be abused.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, does that mean that the Committee on Appropriations can meet at any time?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. It must meet week after week if we are to get away by the time that has been suggested.

here at Pinehurst and at Mid Pines. But even at golf he was intense.

Brien was the kind of a man who didn't know his own limitations, but who once having taken on a scrap, somehow found he didn't have any. He was a courageous fighter, and an indefatigable worker. He was that enviable combination of a politician—shrewd enough to be elected, yet great enough, after election, to become a statesman.

He was a man of very sincere purpose. His heart was right. To know him was to love him.

We shall miss him from our company—and from our country—more, I am sure, than these words of mine could ever express.

LIFE OF BRIEN McMAHON

Born: Norwalk, Conn., October 6, 1903.

Attended Norwalk public schools; graduated from Fordham College in 1924 and from Yale Law School in 1927.

Began the practice of law in Norwalk and became judge of the city court in 1933.

Appointed special assistant to Attorney General Cummings in Washington, D. C., in 1933.

Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, 1935-39.

Resigned from the Department of Justice and established a law practice in Washington, D. C., 1939.

Elected to the United States Senate from Connecticut in 1944 and reelected in 1950 by a large majority.

Author of the McMahon Act (Atomic Energy Act of 1946) which established the principle of civilian control over atomic energy.

Chairman of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, 1945-46. Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 1949-52. Leading member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Democratic Policy Committee.

Died July 28, 1952.

Survived by his widow, Rosemary Turner McMahon, and one daughter, Patricia.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the very near future the Senate will concern itself with the supplemental appropriation measure which includes funds for the Council of Economic Advisers.

As a sponsor of the Employment Act of 1946, under which the Council of Economic Advisers was created, I was shocked to learn of the action of the lower House of Congress in denying funds to the one agency of Government which has the high responsibility of helping to avoid another depression and to promote the growth and stability of the American economy.

On February 25, therefore, I wrote to President Eisenhower asking that he recommend a specific sum for the Council's operations during the remainder of the current fiscal year.

I also asked for the President's views on the question of whether the three-man Council should be continued as such or whether it should be supplanted by a personal economic adviser. I pointed out in the letter some of the reasons why the Congress originally provided for a three-man body. Let me quote from my letter as follows:

In the congressional consideration of the Employment Act of 1946, we explored possible

alternatives to the three-man Council idea, including the idea of a single economic adviser. We came to the conclusion that a single adviser would not have the prestige of a three-member Council in dealing with the many departments and agencies of Government. We felt that a single adviser would tend to become an anonymous personal assistant. We believed that a three-man Council—as finally provided for in the law—could be of more service in reconciling conflicting points of view, developing policies that would win public support and respect, working with the congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and consulting with other economic research agencies, the representatives of business, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments.

Yesterday, I received a reply from President Eisenhower, transmitting a letter of the same date, which the President had sent to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. In the letter the President specifically requested the sum of \$60,000 for the fourth quarter of this fiscal year.

On the question of the structure of the agency, however, President Eisenhower expressed no views. He indicated that he was having a study made of the functions of the agency and that if any statutory changes may be needed in the Employment Act, he will promptly recommend them to the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks my letter of February 25, to President Eisenhower, and the President's letter of February 26 to myself and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
February 25, 1953.
Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Many Members of the Senate are considerably concerned over the future of the Council of Economic Advisers, an agency which, despite its very small size, is one of the most important in the entire executive branch of the Government.

This concern is shared by the many people in organizations throughout the country who, during the 6½ years of the Council's existence, have rightfully come to regard the Council as a valuable guide in avoiding another depression and promoting the growth and stability of the American economy.

As the sponsor of the Employment Act of 1946, under which the Council was created, I have surveyed the present situation with respect to the Council of Economic Advisers and have found that there seems to be considerable uncertainty in the Congress concerning your views on two important questions. Our concern on this matter has been alleviated to a small extent by learning yesterday that on February 4, 1953, the Assistant to the President, Sherman Adams, wrote to the Senate Appropriations Committee asking that the agency be continued. I presume that a similar expression of views was sent to the House Appropriations Committee.

However, after the receipt of this letter of February 4, the House of Representatives eliminated the \$75,000 supplemental appropriation for the Council. If this action is sustained, it will, in effect, abolish the Coun-

cil and defeat the intention of the Congress as expressed in the Employment Act of 1946.

It would seem essential, therefore, that the Members of the Congress have the benefit of your views on the new situation that has been created since Mr. Adams' letter of February 4.

There are two questions which merit attention.

The first of these questions is whether the three-man Council is to be maintained in its present form or is to be supplanted by a single economic adviser.

The House bill, while denying funds for the Council, provided \$25,000 for a single economic adviser. At the same time, speculation has developed concerning the possibility of a reorganization plan that would change the setup of the agency to fit the prescription of the House Appropriations Committee.

In the congressional consideration of the Employment Act of 1946, we explored possible alternatives to the three-man council idea, including the idea of a single economic adviser. We came to the conclusion that a single adviser would not have the prestige of a three-member council in dealing with the many departments and agencies of Government. We felt that a single adviser would tend to become an anonymous personal assistant. We believed that a three-man council—as finally provided for in the law—could be of more service in reconciling conflicting points of view, developing policies that would win public support and respect, working with the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and consulting with other economic research agencies, the representatives of business, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments.

We also recognized that every President should be entirely free under the law to appoint to the Council an entirely new set of economic advisers, and that new Council members need not be bound by the specific views of their predecessors. It is for this reason that I have not thought it relevant in this communication to express my personal views on the achievements of the Council under its former leadership. It is for this reason that I hope you will soon announce your intention to appoint the three Council members provided for under the law.

The second question is whether, if the Council is continued, sufficient funds will be provided for its operations.

In recent years, the Council has been operating at the rate of about \$300,000 a year. While there is some doubt as to whether this sum would be sufficient for it to advise on the perplexing economic problems that face us this year and in future years, there is no doubt but that the Council's work would be seriously impaired by cutting its budget by two-thirds. Yet if it is given only the \$25,000 presently provided in the House bill for a single personal adviser, the Council would be in the position of having to operate at the rate of \$100,000 a year. This would be merely another way of undermining the Employment Act of 1946.

I deeply regret that Mr. Adams' letter of February 4 did not deal concretely with this matter. His letter mentioned no figures whatsoever. Subsequently the figure of \$50,000 has been mentioned as a possible sum for the Council's operations during the fourth quarter. Yet this would reduce the Council's operations by one-third, a reduction which scarcely seems justifiable to me.

Moreover, I see no reason for departing in this instance from the customary budgetary procedure whereby the President presents to the Congress his specific proposals for appropriations.

I hope, therefore, that you may see fit to recommend a specific sum for the Council

and that this sum will be sufficient to allow it to continue its full operations under the Employment Act.

I and other Senators fully recognize the tremendous number of problems that face you and under ordinary circumstances we would be reluctant to press you for your views concerning a small item in an appropriations bill. However, the significance of this particular matter extends far beyond the dollar funds that are involved in the appropriation.

It raises the issue of whether a law passed by the Congress after careful and complete consideration and extensive hearings is to be rendered ineffective or is to be enforced.

It involves the still more important issue of whether or not our country shall be fully prepared to prevent both depression or inflation, and to maintain in the future the economic well-being which is essential to our national and world leadership.

It seems to me, therefore, that a statement of your views on this matter would be exceedingly helpful.

With assurances of my high esteem, I remain

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, February 26, 1953.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I deeply appreciate your thoughtful letter of February 25 respecting the Council of Economic Advisers. I have written to Senator BRIDGES on this subject as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and believe that my letter to him contains substantially the information that you have requested. I therefore enclose a copy of my letter to Senator BRIDGES by way of reply.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

FEBRUARY 26, 1953.

The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of recent developments respecting the Council of Economic Advisers, I think it would be well to make my own position on this matter clear for the purposes of your committee's deliberations.

I want to emphasize, first, that it is not my desire or intention to undermine or set aside the Employment Act of 1946. I believe firmly in the principles enunciated in that measure and have made this clear, or have sought to, on a number of occasions. I also am convinced that the machinery established by this act is essentially sound.

I have found, however, since assuming office, that one of the instrumentalities established by the act, the Council of Economic Advisers, seems not to have the stature that it should have. This is evidenced by the manner in which the prior Congress limited the term of its appropriation. The Employment Act of 1946, in creating the Council of Economic Advisers, did, I believe, make wise provision for aiding the President in his responsibilities with respect to economic stabilization. To my mind, it is essential that the President be able to look to such an agency for long-range thinking and planning in this vital field. My intention is to reinvigorate that body and augment its influence by means of some new personnel and a thorough rethinking of its functions. If the conclusions of this study should indicate a need for statutory change, I shall promptly recommend those changes to the Congress.

I should like to mention specifically the funds which, in my opinion, are needed in the fourth quarter of this fiscal year to carry out the purposes of the statute. I hope that the Congress will provide a sum of \$60,000. By the time hearings can be held on the 1954 budget, we will have proceeded with our reorganization and will request funds in an appropriate amount. If the funds for the fourth quarter of the 1953 fiscal year are too sharply curtailed, it is likely to embarrass us in obtaining the appropriate new leadership required. This amount I have suggested is \$15,000 less than was appropriated by the Congress for each of the first three quarters of the 1953 fiscal year.

With warm personal regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

QUOTA LIMITATIONS ON IMPORTS OF FOREIGN RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

MR. COOPER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1092) to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil, introduced by Mr. COOPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MR. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for a short time upon the bill which I have introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

MR. COOPER. Mr. President, in President Eisenhower's state of the Union message on February 3, when he asked Congress to study the Trade Agreements Act with a view to extending it, he made a most important statement:

This objective must not ignore legitimate safeguarding of domestic industries, agriculture, and labor standards.

The same sentiment was expressed by President Roosevelt when he transmitted the Trade Agreements Act to Congress in 1934. He stipulated that the provisions "must be carefully weighed in the light of the latest information so as to give assurance that no sound and important American interest will be injuriously disturbed." In emphasis he added:

The adjustment of our foreign trade relations must rest on the premise of understanding to benefit and not to injure such interests.

There are few who will dispute the wisdom of this principle, yet there are so many complexities inherent in the very nature of any trade agreement that unanimity of opinion upon its impact on the various phases of our economy is seldom to be expected. When, however, in the conduct of our business with other countries, there arises a situation which causes obvious injury without some offsetting compensatory considerations, the bases of disagreement should be removed. Such a case has been in existence for the past several years, and it has now reached such a point that immediate remedial action is necessary on the part of Congress. This situation is the damaging effect of the importation of foreign

residual oil upon the coal mining industry of the Nation and upon mine employment.

The importation of foreign residual oil got under way on a comparatively moderate scale in the early postwar years, but reached the flood stage in 1949, and by the following year had deluged industrial markets of our east coast. It has grown in intensity, and for the past 3 years has caused great and unnecessary harm to America's coal industry, to allied industries, and to communities and States where coal is produced. Meanwhile there is little evidence that consequent advantages have accrued to anyone—either here or abroad—except to the importing companies. To realize the significance of this situation requires an understanding of what residual oil is, the circumstances under which it is brought into this country, and its actual capacity to displace coal mined in this country.

Residual oil is the residue left over in the refining process after gasoline, kerosene, lubricating oils, and other products are removed from the crude in the oil refinery. It has been described by one of the larger oil importing companies as "the unprofitable end product of the refining process." There is no production cost to be considered when its selling price is set, for it is in the same category with sawdust that accumulates at a lumber yard.

Most of the foreign residual oil now coming into the United States is chiefly the product of Venezuela, and is shipped from refineries in Aruba and Curaçao, two small islands just off the north coast of Venezuela, owned by the Netherlands.

Aruba has a population of less than 50,000 and an area the size of the District of Columbia, and Curaçao is perhaps twice as big in each respect. The total number of employees at the refineries on these islands would in no way approach the size of the labor force in the coal mines of my own State of Kentucky, yet the oil produced at these refineries is directly responsible for reduced work time and unemployment in the mining communities of Kentucky and other States. While the import of residual oil reduces mine employment, ironically it is not the production of residual oil that provides employment for the natives of these islands. If every barrel of residual were prohibited from entering our ports, the economic impact on these foreign refineries would not be conclusive, because gasoline and kerosene and lubricating oil would continue to be produced regardless of the disposition of residual oil.

It follows that the employees in Venezuela's oilfields, where the crude originates, do not depend upon the sale of residual oil for their jobs. The crude will be taken from the ground and shipped to the refineries as long as there are markets for the principal products, and regardless of what happens to the residual. On the other hand, however, the amount of residual oil coming into this country has a direct adverse effect upon the welfare of our own coal miners, our railroaders, and the merchants and

For at least 10 years the world of fashion and that section called society shunned the idea of protesting against anything un-American unless it be fascism. And what is that? Something nonexistent in America, so the influence of the Reds certainly dominated American life for more years than anyone knows and in that time we saw Communists commissioned as officers in the American Army; we saw high Government officials stop an investigation in communism among radio operators aboard merchant marine vessels; we saw the late Dies Committee lauded to high heaven when it undertook its crusade against nazism and German espionage in this country and then trampled almost out of existence when it finished up on nazism and took to prying into communism.

Volumes have been written about it and very late volumes include the reports of the Senate's Committee on Internal Security which show that communism is still hidden in Government and is laughing at us. As long as we make it a matter for Republicans to attack and Democrats to defend it will be the best thing on earth for communism. Instead of that we should have an all-American truce. Let each side decide to let bygones be bygones and join hands.

We have joined hands for a war on the physical threat of cancer; we have joined hands for the Red Cross; we have joined hands in a thousand ways to put the strength of America against an evil, but we seem stalled and ineffective when it comes to a fight against internal domestic communism because politics gets in the way.

Let's run up the flag and sing God Bless America and take an old-time Fourth of July delight in bringing back the old-time home gingham apron-type of Americanism.

We do not have to say we are anti-Fascist, freedom-loving people. We are certainly all for the ideal of worldwide human brotherhood, but we don't have to find any new phrases. The best formula produced so far for everything we hope to be and started to be is Americanism. The one system which recognizes the divine plan for the complete dignity of the individual.

Right now we see our foreign-policy officials adopting, at long last, a hard-boiled attitude against the diplomacy of the Iron-Curtain countries and the American public is fairly well advised on that point. But what is not so apparent is the fact that the motivating power in Communist policy is the Communist plan for an eventual armed conquest of the rest of the world. If not from without a country from the inside and this is ever present in every move Russia makes. Oddly enough very little public attention was paid to the most recent address of Premier Stalin at the opening of the 19th Communist Party Congress, that is, to those few brief sentences in which he once more laid down the Communist principle of gradually infiltrating Communist poison into every nation and forming world brotherhoods of communism so that gradually freedom would be wiped out of the human race. God never intended humanity to be a race of state-driven slaves. If such a thing ever occurs it may be the signal for the Angel Gabriel's last trumpet. God would certainly lower the boom on that experiment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 6 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not like to object, but I hope the Senator from Florida will wait until we complete the business of the morning hour. I have not been very strict in this matter, but many Senators attend the beginning

of the session for the purpose of introducing bills, and presenting other routine matters, and it seems to me that speeches during the morning hour should be confined to 2 minutes with reference to some bill which is being introduced or on some matter related to the business of the morning hour. I wonder if the Senator from Florida would mind withholding his remarks until we complete the business of the morning hour.

Mr. HOLLAND. No, indeed. I understood I was complying with the suggestion of the majority leader. I shall be glad to withhold my remarks until the completion of the business of the morning hour, and then I hope that I shall be recognized before the Senator makes a motion to take up a resolution or bill for consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, Mr. President, any Senator can speak as long as he wants to, but I should like to get something definite before the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection to that.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it the intention of the majority leader to complete action on the resolution today?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and also action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar. Then I shall move to adjourn until Monday, March 2, at noon, when memorial exercises on the late Senator La Follette will be in order. After that, I hope the Senate may take up the supplemental appropriation bill and dispose of it, if possible, on Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Can the Senator give us his plan for the other sessions next week?

Mr. TAFT. So far as I am advised, probably no bills of great importance will be reported or will be ready to be taken up on Wednesday or Friday. It is proposed that the Senate meet on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of next week for the transaction of routine business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Ohio for the information.

CONDEMNATION OF TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS BY RUSSIA AND HER SATELLITES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 43, Senate Resolution 84.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. 84), as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the vicious and inhuman campaigns conducted by the Soviet Government and its puppet governments in satellite states in Europe and Asia against minority groups such as the persecution of Greek orthodox congregations, the imprisonment of Roman Catholic prelates, the harassment of Protestant denominations, the sup-

pression of Moslem communities, the persecution and scattering of ethnic groups in Poland, in the Ukraine, in the Baltic and Balkan States and in many other areas under Soviet domination, and most recently the increasing persecution of the people of the Jewish faith, deserve the strongest condemnation by all peoples who believe that spiritual values are the bases of human progress and freedom.

Resolved further, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "in order that the United Nations shall take such action in opposition to them as may be suitable under its Charter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I think the purpose of the amendment is obvious from its text. I wish to commend the Committee on Foreign Relations for the amendment which they have drafted and placed before the Senate for consideration. It is inclusive, and it covers the important points which, it seems to me, should be covered by a resolution of this type. However, I feel that in the last resolve—that is, the second resolve—it would be well to go further than the resolution now goes. The second resolve now reads as follows:

Resolved further, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages—

I concur wholeheartedly in that statement, but it seems to me that, in order to pin down our intention and action, we should go one step further. In order to take that one step, I have offered the amendment, which the clerk has read. The amendment continues the second resolve, as follows:

in order that the United Nations shall take such action in opposition to them—

The "them" referring to the outrages—as may be suitable under its charter.

It seems to me that, instead of calling on the President to urge the United Nations to act purely as a debating society in this particular instance, it would be better if the resolution as modified by this amendment were to be adopted, and the President, acting through the United States delegation to the United Nations were thus to be requested to act, insofar as such action might be possible, to the end that the purpose of the resolution may be realized through appropriate action taken by the United Nations.

In other words, it seems to me that the General Assembly, instead of merely debating the matter contained in the resolution, should itself at the least adopt a

resolution protesting and condemning the conditions cited in the first resolve of the resolution now before the Senate. This is the reason why I have submitted the amendment to the resolution. I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. I have canvassed the situation among members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I find the amendment of the Senator from New York to be acceptable. I so announce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the Record at this point the resolution as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 84), as amended, is as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the vicious and inhuman campaigns conducted by the Soviet Government and its puppet governments in satellite states in Europe and Asia against minority groups such as the persecution of Greek orthodox congregations, the imprisonment of Roman Catholic prelates, the harassment of Protestant denominations, the suppression of Moslem communities, the persecution and scattering of ethnic groups in Poland, in the Ukraine, in the Baltic and Balkan States, and in many other areas under Soviet domination, and most recently the increasing persecution of the people of the Jewish faith, deserve the strongest condemnation by all peoples who believe that spiritual values are the bases of human progress and freedom.

Resolved further, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages, in order that the United Nations shall take such action in opposition to them as may be suitable under its charter.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I reported to the Senate as an original resolution the pending resolution from the Foreign Relations Committee condemning in the strongest terms the vicious and inhuman persecution of minority groups by the Soviet Union and its satellite states. The resolution further calls upon the President to protest these persecutions and in particular suggests the United Nations General Assembly as an appropriate forum for protest.

The pending resolution grew out of Senate Resolution 70, submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and 21 other Senators, and Senate Resolution 71, submitted by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. Those two resolutions were submitted on February 16 and referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, and became the working basis of the resolution on which the Senate is now about to act.

Each of these resolutions condemned the recent manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Senate Resolution 70 expressed the expectation that the United States Government would convey its concern to the Soviet Government, while Senate Resolution 71

invited the attention of all persons believing in democracy and human freedom to the similarities between communism and fascism. Senate Resolution 70 spoke only of the U. S. S. R.; Senate Resolution 71 was directed to the Soviet Union and its satellite states.

When we considered these resolutions in the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. President, it at once became apparent that what we were dealing with was not simply anti-Semitism but widespread, calculated persecution of any minority group where such persecution would further the vicious designs of the masters of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

A subcommittee was therefore appointed, consisting of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], chairman, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] to consider the broader aspects of the problem; and the resolution which is now before the Senate is the result of the subcommittee's deliberations.

The resolution condemns Soviet persecution of minority groups in general, and it specifically mentions the persecution of Greek orthodox congregations, the imprisonment of Roman Catholic prelates, the harassment of Protestant denominations, the suppression of Moslem communities, the persecution and scattering of ethnic groups in Poland, the Ukraine, the Baltic States, the Balkans, and elsewhere, and the recent increasing persecution of people of the Jewish faith.

It further urges the President "to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages."

Mr. President, this is a much stronger resolution than either of those originally presented to the Senate. It condemns the actions against minority groups, not only of the Soviet Government but also of its puppet governments in satellite states in Europe and Asia. It also makes it plain that these actions are aimed at all peoples who believe that spiritual values are the bases of human progress and freedom. In short, the resolution recognizes the fact that the question of minority rights is indivisible, that no religion is safe where one is in danger, and that a despotism which seeks to destroy the integrity of one ethnic group today will attack others tomorrow.

The entire civilized world has been horrified at the most recent anti-Semitic outrages on the part of the Soviet Union and its satellites—the phony trials in Czechoslovakia, the charges against Jewish doctors in Moscow, and other events culminating in the severance of diplomatic relations with Israel following the bombing of the Soviet Legation in Tel Aviv. It is not beyond belief that the bombing was deliberately carried out by the Communists themselves in order to provide the pretext for actions which they intended to take in any event.

But, Mr. President, this wave of anti-Semitism is completely consistent with the whole Soviet record toward minorities. It is part of a pattern of persecu-

tion which calls for action against whichever minority happens to provide the target best calculated to achieve the Kremlin's ends at home or abroad.

Communism is, of course, basically antireligious. It is against any religion and all religions. Thus the Kremlin has carried on a consistent campaign of harassment and oppression against the Russian Orthodox Church, which is the largest in the Soviet Union. The Roman Catholic Church is the largest in most of the satellites, and it has been the object of a similar campaign. Catholic prelates have been imprisoned and in some cases executed. Protestant groups likewise are controlled and regulated, and the state has attempted to suppress the large Moslem communities in the U. S. S. R. The Shar'iat, the Mohammedan code of laws and rules of life, has been liquidated, and in some areas Moslems are not allowed to be married by mullahs.

In addition to these activities directed against religious groups, the Kremlin has persecuted and attempted to destroy many ethnic groups within the Iron Curtain area. I think it could be fairly said that the campaigns against some of these groups, particularly those in the Ukraine and the Baltic States, as well as in Poland and the Balkans, amount to genocide. Whole peoples have been deported en masse, and in some areas have been the targets of systematic campaigns of extermination.

Mr. President, by adopting the pending resolution, we can make it clear that we will not remain silent in the face of such premeditated terror. We can let the oppressed peoples of Russia and the satellites know that we have not forgotten them in their agony. The conscience of mankind can still be heard, Mr. President. I hope the vote on the resolution will be unanimous.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that I commend him and the committee for the action they have taken in connection with the pending resolution. I have received much correspondence on this subject, and have had many talks with citizens of Massachusetts whose ancestors came from the countries mentioned, and who are intensely concerned about these outrages. I am happy to join with the chairman and other members of the committee in supporting the resolution, as amended.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I also wish to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin and his committee for reporting this very timely and necessary resolution.

I wish it were the privilege of every American citizen to join with us in adopting this resolution, because indeed it embodies the very spirit of Americanism.

If our way of life were stripped of its basic freedoms our institutions would be different and we, as individuals, would

H. R. 3053

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 27, 1953

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. BRIDGES to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, viz:

1 On page 7, line 12, before the period insert a colon and
2 the following: "*Provided*, That for the fiscal year begin-
3 ning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each
4 local educational agency of a State, which provides free pub-
5 lic education during such year for children who reside with a
6 parent employed on Federal property situated within reason-
7 able commuting distance from the school district of such
8 agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to
9 payments under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law
10 874, Eighty-first Congress, with respect to such children in
11 the same manner as if such Federal property were situated
12 in the same State as such agency".

83d CONGRESS
1ST Session

H. R. 3053

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. BRIDGES to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 27, 1953

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

83^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3053

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 27, 1953

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER) to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, viz: On page 8, after line 10, insert the following:

1 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

2 CONSTRUCTION

3 Notwithstanding the prohibition against the purchase of
4 land from appropriations for Construction, Bureau of Indian
5 Affairs, contained in the Act of July 9, 1952, Public Law
6 470, Eighty-second Congress, second session, the Secretary
7 of the Interior is authorized to purchase from said appro-
8 priation not to exceed fifteen hundred acres of nonreservation
9 lands in Arizona, and necessary rights-of-way and easements

1 required for the enlargement of the Picacho Reservoir of
2 the San Carlos Indian irrigation project, and approximately
3 five acres of allotted Indian lands within the Yakima Indian
4 Reservation, Washington, for use of the Wapato irrigation
5 project.

83d CONGRESS
1st Session

H. R. 3053

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER) to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

FEBRUARY 27, 1953

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued Mar. 3, 1953
For actions of Mar. 2, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 35

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Adjournment.....6 | Farm policy.....30 | Personnel.....22 |
| Animal industry.....11,25 | Forestry.....33 | Prices, farm.....3,34 |
| Appropriations.....2,11 | Health.....14 | Reclamation.....21,31 |
| Bankruptcy.....19 | Inflation.....18 | Research.....24 |
| Civil defense.....5 | Investigations.....26 | Small business.....4 |
| Cotton.....17 | Labor, farm.....3 | St. Lawrence seaway.....28 |
| Cumberland River.....20 | Lands, public.....8,15 | Statehood.....16,32 |
| Dairy price supports.....1 | Livestock products.....25 | Trade, foreign.....13,27 |
| Dairy products.....25 | Loans, farm.....3,12 | Treaties.....7 |
| Economic advisers.....2 | Meat imports.....29 | Vegetable grading.....10 |
| Electrification.....2,9,31 | Organization.....23 | Wheat support program.....35 |

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. Thye spoke favoring dairy price supports at 90% of parity. Senate passed 2nd supplemental appropriation bill. Rep. Hagen introduced measure to purchase beef and butter for foreign relief. Rep. Hunter defended Secy. on price supports

SENATE

1. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Thye spoke in favor of price supports on dairy products at 90% of parity and defended the Secretary on the matter (pp. 1579-81).
2. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 3053 (pp. 1583-90). Sens. Bridges, Ferguson, Cordon, Hayden, and Russell were appointed Senate conferees (p. 1590). Agreed to the following committee amendments:
 - Transferring \$15,000,000 of the REA loan authorization from rural electrification to rural telephones (p. 1585).
 - Providing \$60,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers and striking out the item of \$25,000 for an economic adviser and staff (p. 1585). Sen. Murray spoke in favor of the amendment (p. 1583).
 - Providing funds to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments against the Government (p. 1585).*
3. FARM PRICES, LOANS, LABOR. Sen. Humphrey inserted resolutions from Farmers' Union locals favoring stronger price supports, emergency farm loans, and deferment of farm labor from selective service (pp. 1567-8).
4. SMALL BUSINESS. Received the annual report of the Small Business Committee (S. Rept. 49)(p. 1571).
5. NOMINATION. Confirmed the nomination of Val Peterson to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator (p. 1592).
6. ADJOURNED until Wed., Mar. 4 (p. 1592).

* For additional items in the bill, see Digests 26 and 28.

HOUSE

7. TREATIES. Rep. Dolliver spoke in favor of H. J. Res. 25, to amend the constitution to limit the power of treaties and executive agreements (pp. 1608-12).
8. PUBLIC LANDS. Passed without amendment H. R. 1816, to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain (pp. 1600-1).
9. ELECTRIFICATION. Received from the Federal Power Commission its publication, "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1951, Publicly Owned" (p. 1622).
10. VEGETABLE GRADING. Received an Idaho Legislature memorial urging legislation protecting the consumers of fresh vegetables as to the grades and origin, and imposing a fine upon any wholesale or retail dealer repacking under inferior grades or failing to advertise the origin of fresh vegetables (p. 1624).
11. APPROPRIATIONS. Received a S. Dak. Legislature memorial requesting an increase in BAI appropriations to be used in S. Dak. to "more adequately prosecute cooperative programs on livestock disease control and eradication" (p. 1624).

BILLS INTRODUCED

12. FARM LOANS. S. 1152, by Sen. Millikin (for himself and Sen. Johnson of Colo.), to extend for 5 years the authority of this Department to make loans to fur farmers; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 1572).
13. FOREIGN TRADE. S. 1157, by Sen. Hendrickson, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to permit the reimportation free of duty of certain articles exported under lease to foreign manufacturers; to Finance Committee (p. 1572).
14. HEALTH. S. 1153, by Sen. Ives (for himself and Sen. Flanders), to facilitate broader distribution of health services, etc.; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee (p. 1572). Similar H. R. 3582, by Rep. D'Ewart; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 1623). Also H. R. 3586, by Rep. Javits.
S. 1154, by Sen. Ives (for himself and Sen. Flanders), to provide for deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for income-tax purposes; to Finance Committee (p. 1572). Similar H. R. 3583, by Rep. D'Ewart, and H. R. 3585, by Rep. Javits; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 1623).
15. PUBLIC LANDS. H. R. 3542, by Rep. Hyde, to authorize the Interior Department to exchange with other departments lands along the C&O Canal; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 1622).
16. HAWAII. H. R. 3575, by Rep. Saylor, to provide statehood for Hawaii; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 1622).
17. COTTON. H. R. 3576, by Rep. Abernethy, to facilitate the adjustment of cotton production and marketing; to Agriculture Committee (p. 1622).
18. INFLATION. H. R. 3577, by Rep. Buckley; H. R. 3578, by Rep. Byrne of Pa.; H. R. 3592, by Rep. O'Hara of Ill.; and H. R. 3610, by Rep. Rooney; to aid in controlling inflation; to Banking and Currency Committee (pp. 1622-3).
19. BANKRUPTCY. H. R. 3584, by Rep. Hunter, to amend the Bankruptcy Act; to

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3053

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 2, 1953

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply sup-
5 plemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30,
6 1953, and for other purposes, namely:

7 CHAPTER I

8 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

9 (1) *SENATE*

10 (2) *For payment to Rosemary T. McMahon, widow of Brien*

1 *McMahon, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut,*
2 *\$12,500.*

3 **(3)***SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES*

4 **(4)***The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees*
5 *of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Approp-*
6 *riation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of*
7 *additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State*
8 *of Florida, so that the allowance for administrative and*
9 *clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that*
10 *allowed other Senators from States having a population of*
11 *more than three million but less than five million, the popula-*
12 *tion of said State having exceeded three million inhabitants.*

13 **(5)***The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees*
14 *of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Approp-*
15 *riation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment*
16 *of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the*
17 *State of New Jersey, so that the allowance for administrative*
18 *and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that*
19 *allowed other Senators from States having a population of*
20 *more than five million but less than ten million, the population*
21 *of said State having exceeded five million inhabitants.*

22 **(6)***Office of the Secretary: Effective March 1, 1953, the*
23 *appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the*
24 *Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation*
25 *Act for the fiscal year 1953 is made available for the com-*

1 *persation of one camera and sound engineer, Joint Record-*
 2 *ing Facility, at the basic rate of \$4,080 per annum, and*
 3 *one shipping clerk, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic*
 4 *rate of \$1,500 per annum.*

5 **(7) CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE**

6 **(8)** *Joint Committee on Printing: For an additional amount*
 7 *for salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing, at rates to*
 8 *be fixed by the committee, \$555.*

9 **(9)** *Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy:*
 10 *For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Immi-*
 11 *gration and Nationality Policy, including the objects specified*
 12 *in section 401, Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress,*
 13 *second session, \$14,000; notwithstanding subsection (j) of*
 14 *section 401, amount to be disbursed by the Secretary of the*
 15 *Senate, upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the*
 16 *Joint Committee.*

17 **(10)** *Vice President's automobile: For an additional amount*
 18 *for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation*
 19 *of an automobile for the Vice President, \$980.*

20 **(11)** *Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount*
 21 *for "Expenses of inquiries and investigations", \$500,000.*

22 **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

23 For payment to Ona Stigler, widow of William G.
 24 Stigler, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma,
 25 \$12,500.

1 For payment to Mae Ruth Sabath, widow of Adolph
 2 J. Sabath, late a Representative from the State of Illinois,
 3 \$12,500.

4 For payment to Grace Hill Cox, widow of Eugene E.
 5 Cox, late a Representative from the State of Georgia,
 6 \$12,500.

7 (12) SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

8 *Office of the Clerk: For an additional amount for the*
 9 *"Office of the Clerk", \$3,835 to be available for the com-*
 10 *pensation of one editor and laboratory supervisor, effective*
 11 *March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of \$4,020 per annum, and*
 12 *one script writer and general secretary, effective March 1,*
 13 *1953, at a basic rate of \$2,500 per annum, Joint Recording*
 14 *Facility.*

15 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

16 Furniture: For an additional amount for "Furniture",
 17 \$58,750, to remain available until June 30, 1954, and the
 18 unexpended balance of the appropriation, "Contingent ex-
 19 penses, House of Representatives, furniture, 1952", is hereby
 20 made available until June 30, 1954.

21 Special and select committees: For an additional amount
 22 for salaries and expenses of special and select committees
 23 authorized by the House, \$500,000.

24 Stationery (revolving fund) : For an additional amount
 25 for "Stationery (revolving fund)", for the first session of the

1 Eighty-third Congress, \$800, to remain available until
2 expended.

3 Automobiles for majority and minority leaders: Funds
4 appropriated for "Contingent expenses of the House" are
5 hereby made available for purchase, exchange, driving,
6 maintenance, repair, and operation of two automobiles, one
7 for the majority leader of the House, and one for the minority
8 leader of the House.

9 EDUCATION OF SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

10 For an additional amount for Education of Senate, House,
11 and Supreme Court pages, \$2,570.

12 (13) *ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL*

13 (14) *CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS*

14 (15) *Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for "Capi-*
15 *tol Buildings" \$3,651, of which \$2,851 shall be for payment*
16 *to Skinker and Garrett, contractor, for constructing brick*
17 *arches under the main entrance portico steps of the Capitol*
18 *Building to support the 1953 Inaugural stands.*

19 (16) *Senate Restaurant: For repairs, improvements, furnish-*
20 *ings and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Capitol Build-*
21 *ing, including personal and other services, \$1,600, to be*
22 *expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the super-*
23 *vision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration,*
24 *without regard to section 370.9 of the Revised Statutes, as*
25 *amended.*

1 (17) *Senate Office Building: For an additional amount for*
2 *“Senate Office Building”, \$54,000.*

3 THE JUDICIARY

4 (18) *SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES*

5 *PREPARATION OF RULES FOR CIVIL PROCEDURE*

6 *For expenses of the Supreme Court incident to proposed*
7 *amendments or additions to the rules of civil procedure for*
8 *the United States district courts pursuant to title 28,*
9 *United States Code, section 2072, to be expended as the*
10 *Chief Justice in his discretion may approve, including per-*
11 *sonal services in the District of Columbia, printing and*
12 *binding, and per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses*
13 *for subsistence at rates to be fixed by him not to exceed \$10*
14 *per day, \$11,500, to remain available until June 30, 1954.*

15 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

16 FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

17 *For an additional amount for “Fees of commissioners”,*
18 *\$107,000.*

19 FEES OF JURORS

20 *For an additional amount for “Fees of jurors”, \$200,000.*

21 MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

22 *For an additional amount for “Miscellaneous salaries”,*
23 *\$20,600.*

SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

For an additional amount for "Salaries of court reporters", \$15,700.

SALARIES OF REFEREES

For an additional amount for "Salaries of referees", \$134,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall be available for payment of the salaries of referees at the increased rates authorized by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1952, effective as of October 1, 1952.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,

UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended (19), of which \$1,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "International Information and Educational Activities", Department of State Appropriation Act, 1953.

(20) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Attorney General is hereby authorized to transfer from appropriations contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, not to exceed \$270,000 to the appropriation "Fees and expenses of witnesses, Justice",

1 1953, and not to exceed \$600,000 to the appropriation "Sup-
2 port of United States prisoners, Federal prison system",
3 1953.

4 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

5 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

6 ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR-NAVIGATION FACILITIES

7 For an additional amount for "Establishment of air-
8 navigation facilities", \$2,500,000, to remain available until
9 expended.

10 FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

11 For an additional amount for "Federal-aid airport pro-
12 gram, Federal Airport Act", for liquidation of obligations
13 incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head
14 to enter into contracts, \$3,500,000, to remain available until
15 June 30, 1955.

16 PATENT OFFICE

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
19 (21) ~~\$100,000~~ \$130,000.

20 BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

21 FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

22 For an additional amount for "Federal-aid highways", to
23 remain available until expended, \$185,000,000, which sum
24 is composed of \$72,500,000, the remainder of the amount

1 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, and
 2 \$112,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appro-
 3 priated for the fiscal year 1952.

4 ACCESS ROADS (ACT OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1950)

5 For an additional amount for "Access roads (Act of
 6 September 7, 1950)" ~~(22)~~for liquidation of obligations in-
 7 curred pursuant to the contract authority granted by the Act
 8 of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422), \$8,000,000, to remain
 9 available until expended, *to remain available until expended,*
 10 \$18,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obli-
 11 gations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted
 12 by the Act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422).

13 CHAPTER III

14 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

15 BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

16 ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

17 For an additional amount for "Administering the
 18 public debt", \$750,000.

19 ~~(23)~~POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

20 *(Out of the postal revenues)*

21 ~~(24)~~POSTAL OPERATIONS

22 For an additional amount for "Postal operations",
 23 \$28,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropria-
 24 tion "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953.

1 (25) CLAIMS

2 For an additional amount for "Claims", \$300,000, to
3 be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transporta-
4 tion of mails", fiscal year 1953.

5 CHAPTER IV

6 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

7 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

8 (26) SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses”,
10 \$80,000.

11 GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

12 AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

13 For an additional amount for "Grants to States for
14 unemployment compensation and employment service ad-
15 ministration", \$6,750,000; and appropriations granted under
16 this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available for ex-
17 penses not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out
18 title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of
19 1952 (66 Stat. 684).

20 UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS

21 For payments to unemployed veterans as authorized
22 by title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of
23 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$27,200,000, to remain available un-
24 til June 30, 1954.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$150,000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Economic Stabilization Agency, 1953" and \$50,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Mexican Farm Labor Program, 1953", to remain available until July 31, 1953: *Provided*, That these funds shall be utilized solely for the continuation through June 1953 of a consumer price index upon the same basis employed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in compiling such an index for the period prior to January 1, 1953.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount for "Payments to school districts", \$20,500,000 (27): *Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed on Federal property situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be

1 *entitled to payments under the provisions of section 3 (b)*
 2 *of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, with respect to*
 3 *such children in the same manner as if such Federal property*
 4 *were situated in the same State as such agency.*

5 **(28) SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION**

6 *The amount made available under this head in the*
 7 *Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, for necessary*
 8 *expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies, is*
 9 *increased from “\$750,000” to “\$875,000”.*

10 **SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION**

11 **SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND**

12 **SURVIVORS INSURANCE**

13 *The amount authorized by the Federal Security Agency*
 14 *Appropriation Act, 1953, to be expended from the Federal*
 15 *old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, for “Salaries and*
 16 *expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance”, is*
 17 *increased from “\$60,500,000” to “\$62,500,000”.*

18 **GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE**

19 *For an additional amount for “Grants to States for public*
 20 *assistance”, \$340,000,000.*

21 **(29) NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD**

22 **(30) SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

23 *For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses”,*
 24 *\$7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation*

1 “Salaries and expenses”, National Railroad Adjustment
2 Board, fiscal year 1953.

3 (31) ARBITRATION AND EMERGENCY BOARDS

4 For an additional amount for “Arbitration and emer-
5 gency boards”, \$10,000, to be derived by transfer from the
6 appropriation “Salaries and expenses”, National Railroad
7 Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.

8 (32) NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 The amount made available under this head in the
11 National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1953,
12 exclusively for compensation and expenses of referees is
13 decreased from “\$216,000” to “\$199,000”.

14 (33) CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF AGRI-
15 CULTURE

16 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

17 LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

18 The basic amount authorized by the Department of
19 Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, to be borrowed from
20 the Secretary of the Treasury for the rural electrification
21 program is decreased from “\$50,000,000” to “\$35,000,-
22 000,” and the basic amount authorized by said Act to be
23 borrowed for the rural telephone program is increased from
24 “\$25,000,000” to “\$40,000,000”.

CHAPTER (34)V VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RESEARCH IN THE UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

For an additional amount for "Research in the utilization of saline water", \$50,000.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", \$60,000.

(35)BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONSTRUCTION

Notwithstanding the prohibition against the purchase of land from appropriations for Construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs, contained in the Act of July 9, 1952, Public Law 470, Eighty-second Congress, second session, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase from said appropriation not to exceed fifteen hundred acres of nonreservation lands in Arizona, and necessary rights-of-way and easements required for the enlargement of the Picacho Reservoir of the San Carlos Indian irrigation project, and approximately five acres of allotted Indian lands within the Yakima Indian Reservation, Washington, for use of the Wapato irrigation project.

BUREAU OF MINES

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Health and safety", \$266,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available for the purchase of fifty passenger motor vehicles in addition to those heretofore provided.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF
REVIEW

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$20,000.

CHAPTER ~~(36)~~ VI VII

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

~~(37)~~ THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, \$25,000.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",

1 \$60,000; and said appropriation shall remain available
2 through June 30, 1953.

3 EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

4 NATIONAL DEFENSE

5 For an additional amount for "Emergency fund for the
6 President, national defense", ~~(38)\$75,000~~ \$250,000.

7 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

8 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

9 INVESTIGATIONS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOY-

10 MENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

11 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
12 Executive Order No. 10422, approved January 9, 1953,
13 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secre-
14 tary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads
15 of other international organizations, certain information con-
16 cerning United States citizens employed, or being considered
17 for employment by such organizations, \$1,000,000, to be
18 derived by transfer from the appropriation for "International
19 Information and Educational Activities", Department of
20 State Appropriation Act, 1953: *Provided*, That this ap-
21 propriation may be apportioned for use pursuant to Section
22 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, prior to April 1,
23 1953: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be
24 available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable
25 appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission

1 and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses in-
2 curred by such agencies under said Executive order.

3 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

4 The limitation under this head in the Independent Offices
5 Appropriation Act, 1953, as amended by the Supplemental
6 Appropriation Act, 1953, on the amount available for ex-
7 penses of travel, is hereby increased from "\$1,648,275" to
8 "\$1,800,000".

9 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

10 ADMINISTRATION, MEDICAL, HOSPITAL, AND DOMICILIARY
11 SERVICES

12 For an additional amount for "Administration, medical,
13 hospital, and domiciliary services", \$10,000,000.

14 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

15 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
16 sions", \$237,573,000, to remain available until expended.

17 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

18 For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits",
19 \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

20 SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITIES

21 For an additional amount for "Servicemen's indem-
22 nities", \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

23 VETERANS' MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS

24 For an additional amount for "Veterans' miscellaneous
25 benefits", \$1,361,000, to remain available until expended.

1 **(39)GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES**

2 For an additional amount for “Grants to the Republic of
3 the Philippines”, \$1,000,000.

4 REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

5 SOLDIERS’ AND SAILORS’ CIVIL RELIEF

6 The appropriation heretofore granted for “Soldiers’ and
7 sailors’ civil relief” is hereby reduced by the sum of \$1,000,-
8 000, and said amount shall be carried to the surplus of the
9 Treasury.

10 CHAPTER **(40)**~~VII~~ *VIII*

11 CIVIL FUNCTIONS

12 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

13 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

14 Not to exceed \$15,000 of the amount appropriated
15 under this head in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act,
16 1953, for construction and major equipment, shall be avail-
17 able for payment to the Republic of Panama for an ex-
18 pansion of its Colon sewage disposal facilities to serve the
19 Canal Zone.

20 PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

21 The amount made available under this head in the
22 Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953, for general and
23 administrative expenses of the Panama Canal Company, is
24 hereby increased from “\$3,301,800” to “\$3,557,000”.

CHAPTER (41)~~VIII~~ IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY FUNCTIONS

For additional amounts for the following appropriations of not to exceed the amounts stated:

“Claims”, Department of Defense, \$1,000,000;

“Retired pay”, Department of Defense, \$25,000,000;

“Military personnel, Army”, \$725,724,000;

“Military personnel, Navy”, \$140,000,000;

“Military personnel, Marine Corps”, \$63,000,000;

“Military personnel requirements”, Department of the Air Force, \$115,000,000; the foregoing amounts under this heading to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation during the fiscal year 1953 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

The unexpended balance of the appropriation “Marine Corps troops and facilities, 1951” shall remain available during the fiscal year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder for procurement of ordnance, ammunition, and other military equipment.

1 SHIPS AND FACILITIES

2 The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Ships
3 and facilities, 1951" shall remain available during the fiscal
4 year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder
5 for procurement of electronics equipment.

6 ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

7 The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Ordnance
8 and facilities, 1951" shall remain available during the fiscal
9 year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder
10 for (1) production and procurement of Navy ordnance and
11 ammunition and (2) procurement of plant equipment,
12 appliances, and machine tools.

13 DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

14 AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

15 Of the appropriation granted under this head in the
16 Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953,
17 \$1,685,044,000 shall be used to complete the liquidation
18 of all obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously
19 granted under this head to enter into contracts.

20 (42)CHAPTER X

21 CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

22 *For payment of claims for damages as settled and de-*
23 *termined by departments and agencies in accord with law,*
24 *audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting*
25 *Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by*

1 *United States district courts and the United States Court of*
 2 *Claims, as set forth in Senate Document Numbered 19,*
 3 *Eighty-third Congress, \$13,230,038, together with such*
 4 *amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when*
 5 *specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of*
 6 *the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such*
 7 *additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may*
 8 *be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: Provided,*
 9 *That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until*
 10 *it shall have become final and conclusive against the United*
 11 *States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: Pro-*
 12 *vided further, That, unless otherwise specifically required by*
 13 *law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appro-*
 14 *priated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty*
 15 *days after the date of approval of this Act.*

16 CHAPTER (43)~~IX~~ XI

17 GENERAL PROVISIONS

18 SEC. (44)~~901~~ 1101. No part of any appropriation con-
 19 tained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by
 20 any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the
 21 salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike
 22 against the Government of the United States or who is a
 23 member of an organization of Government employees that
 24 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
 25 United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an or-

1 ganization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government
2 of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for
3 the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima
4 facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not
5 contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike
6 against the Government of the United States, is not a member
7 of an organization of Government employees that asserts the
8 right to strike against the Government of the United States,
9 or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member
10 of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the
11 Government of the United States by force or violence: *Pro-*
12 *vided further*, That any person who engages in a strike
13 against the Government of the United States or who is a
14 member of an organization of Government employees that
15 asserts the right to strike against the Government of the
16 United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an
17 organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Govern-
18 ment of the United States by force or violence and accepts
19 employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any
20 appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall
21 be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not
22 more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year,
23 or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause
24 shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other
25 provisions of existing law.

- 1 SEC. ~~(45)902~~ 1102. This Act may be cited as the
- 2 "Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953".

Passed the House of Representatives February 19, 1953.

Attest: LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments March 2, 1953.

Attest: J. MARK TRICE,
Secretary.

83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3053

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 2, 1953

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 44, which is the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering the second supplemental appropriation bill, so-called, which is the first appropriation bill of the 1953 session of Congress.

A great many persons in the United States and a great many Members of the Senate have had considerable to say about economy and about balancing the budget. The first appropriation bill of the 1953 session is now before the Senate, and this is the time for the Senate to proceed to effect economy.

I believe the Appropriations Committee has done a good job on the bill. Let me point out that the appropriation items submitted by the President and the Bureau of the Budget, and considered by the Senate committee, totaled \$2,327,521,114. The bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee to the Senate calls for appropriations in the amount of \$947,325,579, or a decrease of \$1,380,195,535 from the estimates and the budget requests.

The bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee differs in only minor respects from the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. Items now included in the bill, as reported, which were not in the bill as passed by the House, are largely ones which were never submitted to the House of Repre-

sentatives, but came in subsequent budget estimates. For instance, in that connection let me refer to an item of \$13 million for claims and judgments. There is nothing the Congress can do about claims, once they have been passed upon by the courts and once the courts have settled their amounts, we can only appropriate the amount.

Various other small items are contained in the bill; but the House of Representatives in considering the bill kept economy in mind, and I believe the Senate committee has held it to the same test. I hope we can proceed to act on the bill without any great delay.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Inasmuch as I have to attend a hearing in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the so-called tidelands-oil legislation, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD some remarks I have prepared in connection with the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY ON APPROPRIATION FOR COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS AND CONFUSED ECONOMIC POLICIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

I should like to make a few brief comments on the supplemental appropriation for the Council of Economic Advisers.

THREE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL SHOULD BE APPOINTED

First of all, I should like to point out that the \$60,000, provided for the Council of Economic Advisers by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, is unique in one respect: It is the only appropriation item for an agency which has no head.

While I support the committee's action in restoring the funds that had been eliminated by the other House, I believe it is essential that appointments be made promptly to fill the three positions on the Council of Economic Advisers as provided for under the Employment Act of 1946.

WIDESPREAD CONFUSION ON ECONOMIC POLICY

At the present moment, we see on all sides a growing confusion in the economic policies of the administration.

In the field of agriculture there seems to be a serious unawareness of the possible dangers confronting the American farmers and of the dangerous impact of declining farm prices on the rest of the economy.

In the field of fiscal policy, we are told, on the one hand, that many billions of dollars of wasteful expenditures can be eliminated and, on the other hand, that very few budget cuts can be expected.

We are told on one day that taxes can be reduced and on another day that they cannot be reduced.

On the one hand—presumably because inflationary pressures have abated—we see price controls abandoned and margin requirements on the stock market reduced.

On the other hand, we are told that higher interest rates are needed to stem inflation.

CONFUSION AND WASTE IN INTEREST RATES

We are told, on the one hand, that more of the public debt should be placed in long-term bonds, but, on the other hand, the Treasury Department replaces almost \$9 bil-

lion of 11½-month securities with securities maturing in only 12 months.

We are told that a primary purpose of the administration is to reduce costs. Yet in this recent refinancing operation—which is the biggest single action the new administration has taken in the field of economic policy—the Secretary of the Treasury has boosted the rate of interest from 1½ percent to 2¼ percent.

This increase of three-eighths of 1 percent means an increased cost to the Government—and increased profit to the bankers—of \$34 million a year, a figure verified by the Secretary of the Treasury. This sum alone is twice what would be needed to expand and improve our Nation's facilities for training an adequate supply of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

We are told that this costly increase in interest payments is forced upon us by the fact that the market rate has risen as a result of the automatic operation of the law of supply and demand. Yet the financial expert of the New York Times who reported upon the refinancing operation in the New York Times of February 15 said that one consideration in the higher interest rate was—and I quote—"the willingness of the Treasury to pay even more than the market rate."

NEED FOR COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

It was to deal with problems of this type that the Congress provided for the Council of Economic Advisers in the Employment Act of 1946.

The primary purpose of the Council of Economic Advisers is to develop a consistent and integrated economic policy which will promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The members of the Council of Economic Advisers, when appointed, will obviously not find their task an easy one.

Any Council of Economic Advisers, when appointed, will probably find itself faced with the necessity of recommending many changes and improvements in the present economic policies of the present administration.

Because of the obvious need for such changes and improvements, I sincerely hope that the appointments will be made without further delay.

SIXTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ADEQUATE FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR

As for the specific sum of \$60,000 to carry the Council through the remainder of this fiscal year, I am highly gratified with the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee. This decision, if sustained, will reverse the action of the other House which, by deleting funds for the Council of Economic Advisers, would have defeated the intent of the Congress as expressed in the Employment Act of 1946.

The sum of \$60,000, I am informed, will be sufficient to allow this important agency to operate during the next few months. I assume this figure will be accepted by the Senate; I hope it will be agreed to by the conferees representing the other House.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amount carried by the appropriation bill we are now considering is almost 60 percent below the total amount requested by the Budget Bureau originally. It is actually 59.3 percent below the estimates. Most of the estimates and requests for appropriations were submitted to the Congress by the previous administration. Congress, however, can take little credit for this tremendous reduction in the appropriations carried by this particular bill, for almost all the savings were voluntarily made by the new administration.

Time after time at the appropriations committee hearings we heard officials of the new administration say, "We can get along without that additional appropriation," or "We shall use the funds we already have." This spirit of economy on the part of the executive branch of the Government is something new to me, and I believe it is the spirit which should be shown by the administration.

I have compiled a brief table showing the reductions in appropriation requests which were voluntarily made by the new administration and also the reductions which were made after the House of Representatives or Senate Appropriations Committee brought the attention of the new administration to this subject. The two types of reduction made by the new administration amount to \$1,380,358,500. This total is greater than the amount shown on page 1 of the Senate committee's report as a reduction in the budget estimates, because some of the transfers requested by the new administration are not considered as appropriation estimates or requests. In previous years, however, such transfers were rare, since the emphasis always seemed to be on new and additional appropriations—in other words, on new and additional funds—not on transfers and the use of existing appropriations.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the table of appropriations reductions requested or agreed to by the new administration and also the table of reductions in appropriations requests which were made by the House of Representatives, were accepted by the new administration, and were not appealed to the Senate.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriations reductions requested or agreed to by the new administration

I. INSTANCES AND AMOUNTS OF REDUCTIONS WHERE REQUESTS WERE REDUCED BY NEW ADMINISTRATION BEFORE CONSIDERATION BY CONGRESS

| | |
|--|-------------|
| State Department salaries and expenses | \$360,000 |
| Justice, fees of witness and support of prisoners | 1870,000 |
| Justice, Immigration and Naturalization, salaries and expenses for new law | 1,725,000 |
| Commerce, Patent Office, printing expenses | 5,000 |
| Post Office, postal operations | 128,000,000 |
| Post Office, claims | 1300,000 |
| Department of Labor, Employment Security, salaries and expenses | 31,000 |
| Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics | 1150,000 |
| National Mediation Board, salaries and expenses | 117,000 |
| Agriculture, REA, for telephones | 115,000,000 |
| President's emergency fund | 100,000 |
| Civil Service Commission, for U. N. investigation | 11,000,000 |
| Veterans' Administration, medical and hospital services | 3,074,000 |
| VA, readjustment benefits | 80,640,000 |
| Defense Department, military pay | 145,150,000 |
| Total | 276,422,000 |

¹ By transfer.

II. REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS REQUESTS WHICH WERE MADE BY THE HOUSE, ACCEPTED BY NEW ADMINISTRATION, AND NOT APPEALED TO SENATE

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Judiciary, miscellaneous salary and expenses | \$36,000 |
| State Department, United States-Mexico International Boundary Commission | 1,000,000 |
| Treasury, Bureau of Public Debt | 1,550,000 |
| Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, grants to States | 1,190,000 |
| Labor, unemployment compensation for veterans | 5,000,000 |
| FSA, Office of Education, salaries and expenses | 30,000 |
| FSA, Public Health Service, payment to Hawaii | 56,000 |
| VA, readjustment benefits | 50,418,000 |
| VA, servicemen's indemnities | 500,000 |
| VA, grants to Philippines | 432,500 |
| Defense, military pay | 1,043,724,000 |
| Total | 1,103,936,500 |

¹ By transfer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was under the heading "Chapter I—Legislative Branch," on page 1 after line 8, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Rosemary T. McMahon, widow of Brien McMahon, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, \$12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Florida, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than 3 million but less than 5 million, the population of said State having exceeded 3 million inhabitants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 12, to insert:

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of New Jersey, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than 5 million but less than 10 million, the population of said State having exceeded 5 million inhabitants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to insert:

Office of the Secretary: Effective March 1, 1953, the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953 is made available for the compensation of one camera and sound engineer, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of \$4,080 per annum, and one shipping clerk, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of \$1,500 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 4, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Joint Committee on Printing: For an additional amount for salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing, at rates to be fixed by the committee, \$555.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 8, to insert:

Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, including the objects specified in section 401, Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, second session, \$14,000; notwithstanding subsection (j) of section 401, amount to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 16, to insert:

Vice President's automobile: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, \$980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 19, to insert:

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for "Expenses of inquiries and investigations," \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 4, after line 6, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Clerk: For an additional amount for the "Office of the Clerk," \$3,835 to be available for the compensation of one editor and laboratory supervisor, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of \$4,020 per annum, and one script writer and general secretary, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of \$2,500 per annum, Joint Recording Facility.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS

Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings" \$3,651, of which \$2,851 shall be for payment to Skinker & Garrett, contractor, for constructing brick arches under the main entrance portico steps of the Capitol Building to support the 1953 inaugural stands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 18, to insert:

Senate Restaurant: For repairs, improvements, furnishings and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Capitol Building, including personal and other services, \$1,600, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to insert:

Senate Office Building: For an additional amount for "Senate Office Building," \$54,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Judiciary," on page 6, after line 3, to insert:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PREPARATION OF RULES FOR CIVIL PROCEDURE

For expenses of the Supreme Court incident to proposed amendments or additions to the rules of civil procedure for the United States district courts pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2072, to be expended as the Chief Justice in his discretion may approve, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses for subsistence at rates to be fixed by him not to exceed \$10 per day, \$11,500, to remain available until June 30, 1954.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter II—Department of State—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico", on page 7, line 16, after the word "expended", to insert "of which \$1,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "International information and educational activities", Department of State Appropriation Act, 1953."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 19, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Attorney General is hereby authorized to transfer from appropriations contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, not to exceed \$270,000 to the appropriation "Fees and expenses of witnesses, Justice", 1953, and not to exceed \$600,000 to the appropriation "Support of United States prisoners, Federal Prison System," 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Patent Office—Salaries and Expenses", on page 8, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$130,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Access Roads (Act of September 7, 1950)", on page 9, line 5, after "(Act of September 7, 1950)", to strike out "for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted by the act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422), \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended," and insert "to remain available until expended, \$18,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted by the act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III", on page 9, after line 17, to insert:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

POSTAL OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Postal operations", \$28,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 10, to insert:

CLAIMS

For an additional amount for "Claims", \$300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Department of Labor—Bureau of Employment Security", on page 10, after line 7, to insert:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Security Agency—Office of Education", on page 11, after line 18, to insert:

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The amount made available under this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies, is increased from "\$750,000" to "\$875,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 11, to insert:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses," National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 17, to insert:

ARBITRATION AND EMERGENCY BOARDS

For an additional amount for "Arbitration and emergency boards," \$10,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses," National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 13, to insert:

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in the National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1953, exclusively for compensation and expenses of referees is decreased from "\$216,000" to "\$199,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 6, to insert:

CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

RURAL ELECTRICAL ADMINISTRATION

Loan authorizations

The basic amount authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury for the rural electrification program is decreased from "\$50,000,000" to "\$35,000,000," and the basic amount authorized by said act to be borrowed for the rural telephone program is increased from "\$25,000,000" to "\$40,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 17, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "V" and insert "VI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 18, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VI" and insert "VII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President," on page 14, after line 19, to strike out:

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 15, to insert:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$60,000; and said appropriation shall remain available through June 30, 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Emergency fund for the President—national defense", on page 16, line 9, after the word "defense", to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 3, to strike out:

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For an additional amount for "Grants to the Republic of the Philippines", \$1 million.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 13, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VII" and insert "VIII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 3, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VIII" and insert "IX."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 21, to insert:

CHAPTER X

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document No. 19, 83d Congress, \$13,230,038, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 18, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "IX" and insert "XI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions", on page 20, line 20, to change the section number from "901" to "1101."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 3, to change the section number from "902" to "1102."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to state to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire, that I have before me a letter from Mr. Bernard Weitzer, national legislative director of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. With the letter he has sent me a copy of a telegram, which I have since submitted to the Senator from New Hampshire. The telegram relates to appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. I am not sure whether the telegram was placed in the record of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say that the telegram came in after the hearings were concluded.

Mr. HILL. I assume that the chairman of the committee will have no objection to having the telegram placed at this point in the RECORD; is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. Then, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the telegram to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. STYLES BRIDGES,

Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, I respectfully urge you support full supplemental appropriation requested in Veterans' Administration approved by Budget Bureau \$15,886,000 for administration finance contact service vocational rehabilitation and education loan guarantee program and medical services plus \$10 million additional for medical services. Appropriations cuts in past years have already seriously eroded the VA medical services and staff leading to thousands of unusable hospital beds and causing deaths and dangerous hardships to veterans entitled by law to medical treatment. The appropriations suggested above are urgent now and correction in the 1954 budget will not undo the further ruination of the medical services and the contact service which present cuts will inflict. Contact service is the essential means whereby the veteran is aided to get the benefits you have voted for him. The appeals made to you by some Senators on behalf of veterans in their States awaiting medical service can be duplicated in practically every State in the country where more than 21,000 eligible applicant veterans are waiting to get into hospitals and more than 239,000 applications are pending for outpatient dental treatment, more than 2½ times as many as there were last year. Will appreciate your entering this message in your committee hearings record.

BERNARD WEITZER,
National Legislative Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have now been agreed to, and the bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, under authorization of the Appropriations Committee, and in conformity with a notice given in proper time for the submission of an amendment, I now send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, in line 18, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed on Federal property situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to payments under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law 374, 81st Congress, with respect to such children in the same manner as if such Federal property were situated in the same State as such agency."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that our committee was unanimous in authorizing the Senator from New Hampshire to submit the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The amendment would add nothing to the total amount to be appropriated, but would facilitate greatly the attainment of the objective of giving some help to such areas, regardless of whether the children live in Virginia, the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, or elsewhere. In any event, the purpose is to have them receive the aid Congress intended they should receive.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The amendment is based on the assumption—I may say, in connection with what the distinguished Senator from Virginia has said—that these are Federal funds, and if they are used for school purposes in areas where a great Federal project is in existence, the expenditure of the funds should not be limited by State lines. For example, let us say there is a large plant in Virginia or perhaps in Indiana—I remember one in Indiana—and let us assume that some of the persons working in the plant live in Kentucky—or vice versa. Under the law which has been in effect, they must live within the State where the plant is located in order to obtain benefits. The State boundary is an imaginary line which should not be in effect where Federal funds are to be used. The test should be reasonable commuting distances to the plant, in order that all communities may be treated equally.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I want to call attention to one matter only. This proviso applies not only to this fiscal year but to the succeeding fiscal year. The matter dealt with here will require the passage this year of another school act—an authorization act, as I remember. Consequently, Senators should closely watch to see that that act does not repeal this provision for the succeeding fiscal year. I only want to call attention to the fact that the Senate may later supersede

what is being done here for the next fiscal year. I have no objection to including it in this bill, but it should be covered by permanent legislation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his contribution to the discussion regarding this particular amendment. I should be glad to proceed to explain the amendment at some length, if desired, but I know that all members of the Appropriations Committee understand it. From my talks with most of the other Members of the Senate, I judge that they, too, understand it. It is a fair approach to correct an inequality which prevails at the present time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that a good many States of the Union are affected by this provision?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. About 15 States are affected by it. I have in my hand a list of the States that will be affected. They are Maine, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, Maryland, Iowa, Illinois, Texas, Arkansas, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, South Dakota, and Nebraska. There may be others, but this is the number we have been advised are currently faced with the problem we seek to correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS CONSTRUCTION

Notwithstanding the prohibition against the purchase of land from appropriations for construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs, contained in the act of July 9, 1952, Public Law 470, 82d Congress, 2d session, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase from said appropriation not to exceed 1,500 acres of nonreservation lands in Arizona, and necessary rights-of-way and easements required for the enlargement of the Picacho Reservoir of the San Carlos Indian irrigation project, and approximately 5 acres of allotted Indian lands within the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., for use of the Wapato irrigation project.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment involves no increase in appropriations. Last year in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill there was appropriated for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$17,500,000 for construction of various Indian irrigation projects. There was included in the appropriation bill the customary language, that no part of the sum should be expended for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming, outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, and that no part of the appropriation should be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, either

inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

When we made the appropriation we did not have that provision in mind. There was an allocation of \$300,000 for the improvement of the San Carlos Indian irrigation project in Arizona. But it cannot be used, because the improvement would result in flooding certain lands, principally desert lands which had been acquired. The same thing is true with respect to a pumping plant to be located on the Yakima Indian Reservation in the State of Washington. It is a small tract, but the title must be passed from the Indians to the United States, for the purpose of building the powerplant. This amendment merely makes it possible to do what the Congress intended should be done at the last session.

For the information of the conferees, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a complete statement regarding this matter, which appears at page 277 of the hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Senator HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, in the Interior Department appropriation bill last year, under "Construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs," there is a provision "for construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; an architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended; \$17,500,000 of which \$1,380,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted."

There are two provisos: "Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. As one who has worked long in this particular vineyard with the Senator from Arizona, I desire to add my word to his with respect to the amendment he has just offered. I think the amendment is in the public interest, and that the particular exception, or the two exceptions from the prohibition, should be made. It will be very helpful to the Indians in question, and it is absolutely necessary if the construction projects are to go forward.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in this bill there was one item relating to clerk

hire about which there was some question particularly from Senators of States with large populations. Some of the Senators from large States are paying money out of their own pockets for clerical hire in order to carry their official load. This condition should not prevail, and so far as I am concerned, I think the Senate should take steps to remedy it. However, the other day at the committee meetings, in marking up this bill, it was felt that the formula used to attain the desired objective should be given more study. It was suggested that the sponsor or sponsors of such amendment confer with the chairman and members of the legislative subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, to see whether they could agree on a formula for increased clerical staffs prior to the consideration of the next supplemental or regular appropriation bill. Such action will postpone the date of this relief, and it might impose a burden on Senators. I desired to offer that explanation. I see in the Senate Chamber the very able and distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who was one of the sponsors of this provision, and I shall defer to him if he cares to add anything to this explanation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I raised the question; indeed, as a matter of fact, it was raised in a number of conferences long before the matter was presented to the Appropriations Committee. Senators from States with large populations, particularly populations that are vocal and are given to writing letters, are in the unhappy position of having put upon them an undue burden. I am frank to confess that I am in that unhappy fix.

The formula by which we operate now is broken up into three categories: First, States with a population of less than 3,000,000 are allotted \$39,540 as a base. I confess I have never been able to fathom the intricacies of all the additions to the formula by which that amount is spelled out, because it must take into account nearly every legislative proposal touching the salaries of clerical assistants which at one time or another is enacted.

The next category covers States with populations of from 3 to 5 million; the third, States having populations of from 5 to 10 million; and then those having more than 10 million. I happen to come from a State that has a population of more than 9 million. The population of New Mexico is 1 million; that of New York is in excess of 14 million, or 4 million more than the top figure.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that I find myself in the very unhappy fix of being unable to compete with the House of Representatives when it comes to hiring clerical assistants; nor can I compete with the governmental agencies downtown. Sometimes when a very able person comes forward—a person who might well serve in my office—and I suggest what is the maximum salary I can pay, it is not acceptable, and I discover that I cannot compete with the agencies of the executive branch.

There is one other factor involved, which affects particularly those States that are most remote from the District of Columbia. I refer to the fact that there is no provision today for a transportation allowance for clerks. I think the Members from California would like to give employment to persons from their State, yet we all know that the transportation costs are heavy, indeed, and when the California Members cannot offer enough, it simply means they cannot compete with others who might engage the services of such persons.

Speaking as one whose State is in the category of large States, I simply say to the Senate that I need more help. I cannot go on forever working the life out of my staff. They start early and work until 6 or 7 o'clock at night. They work on Saturdays and Sundays. I bought portable typewriters for some of them so they could work at home, for which they receive no extra compensation. I have procured for them the number of electric typewriters the rule will allow. It becomes a tremendous chore to take care of the mail. It is not so heavy as it was, but in 1951, in a single day, more than 6,000 first-class letters reached my office. They must be answered. The people are entitled to a response from one who represents them in the Senate or in the House of Representatives.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the cost of transportation of an employee is so clearly a serious problem with which many of us are faced that I cannot help but comment on that particular phase of the Senator's statement. The cost of transportation by plane from the city of St. Paul, or the city of Minneapolis, to Washington is approximately \$122.02. We cannot recruit workers from such an area without some kind of travel allowance, because they would expect to go back home at least once a year to see their parents and their friends. In the case of a far western State, such as California or Oregon, to which the fare is in excess of \$300, and no allowance is granted for travel expenses, it is impossible to recruit workers from such localities. Most of the time we have to take employees who offer themselves from the District of Columbia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Minnesota has placed his finger on the point. A Senator would like to favor people in his own State. They are familiar with the conditions in the State, whether it be in agriculture or in industry. They know other persons there, and it serves a very useful purpose in a Senator's office to have employees from his own State, if possible. I am in the unhappy position, because of the limitation on clerical allowances, plus the fact that there is no transportation allowance, of having to content myself with employing persons who are residents of Maryland and Virginia. They are fine people; but what kind of an explanation can we make to the voters back home? I am free to admit that a Member of the Congress does wear a political tab, and peo-

ple want a little favor now and then, and they are rightly entitled to it by every tradition. I have great difficulty because of the straitjacket in which I am compelled to operate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Another grave problem of Senators who come from far-distant States is that from time to time they must return to their respective States and must take some members of their staffs with them in order to conduct their business properly. A year ago I was compelled to take two of the members of my staff and have them establish an office in St. Paul. There are no allowances with which to pay travel expenses of those persons who must return to the States in order to staff the office we establish during the time Congress is in recess.

There is another problem, Mr. President, which apparently no one seems to appreciate or understand, namely, that we must ask some of our staff members to give up their living quarters in the District of Columbia and move out to our own States for a period of 3 or 4 months, and then return to Washington when Congress reconvenes. It involves great expense, and much inconvenience, but conditions are such that it is very difficult to convince persons in the States that they should come to Washington to take positions in the offices of Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is quite correct.

The formula under which we operate is certainly not scientific. How can we justify a jump from a population of 3 million to 5 million persons, when the next category is over 10 million persons? We are penalized in that respect. I worked out a formula which I thought was infinitely better.

I may say, Mr. President, that I certainly do not like to encumber a supplemental appropriation bill, but I know that if we had to wait until the 30th of June it would not become effective in time to be of any assistance. If we were to move up by successive stages, 1 million at a time, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, 4 to 5, then up to 9, and then to 10, and jump by a stated amount of \$3,000 in every category, that would give \$3,000 for every additional 1 million persons.

Some States may be able to get by with the amount of clerical help they have at the present time; but I find great difficulty. There is a city in Illinois with a population of more than 3½ million person, but I can take only 1 person in the office for that large population. We are confronted with enough work to make it entirely worthwhile to have 2 or 3 and thus facilitate a great deal of the work at the Nation's Capital, and give more expeditious service. But that cannot be done under the formula which prevails.

I had hoped that my idea would commend itself to the favor and the grace of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I think the committee did look with favor on the objective which he sought. The committee did favor some action along the lines he has indicated. No definite recommendation was made, but it seemed to be the prevailing view that the legislative subcommittee could furnish a formula and then report its findings in connection with the next appropriation bill to come before the Senate.

The difficulty about acting on the floor at the moment is the haste with which we would have to act in perfecting the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I quite agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I know that one cannot discern at a glance all the things that are involved, so I am generally reluctant to advance an amendment under such circumstances. I wish to say to my distinguished chairman that I shall withhold the amendment in the hope that by the time the next supplemental or deficiency appropriation bill is considered, there will have been an opportunity to explore the question.

Mr. President, I am going to hand this proposal in the form of an amendment to my distinguished chairman, knowing full well that it will receive vigorous, careful scrutiny and attention.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator that we should give a great deal of study to this particular matter. Some Senators now on the floor may recall that the matter was before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. That committee, too, did a great deal of investigating. At that time we found that when we jumped these brackets up to 3 million or a little more, in three categories, that was not enough. There ought to be more of a breakdown.

As an illustration, in my own State, the population is 2,200,000. Yet at the present time there are other States having populations of about 250,000 whose Senators draw the same amount received by those of my State. It can readily be seen that that is not a correct allocation. There ought to be a committee giving this matter special attention and careful study. If that is not done, we will have a great many headaches in the future.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, and other Senators who may be interested, that, so far as I am concerned, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, insofar as I have it within my power to do so, I shall see to it that the legislative subcommittee makes a study of the question, and that the full committee acts on it, in connection with the next bill in which it can be appropriately included. I assume there will be another supplemental appropriation bill. The question should be considered by the legislative subcommittee, and something along the suggested

lines might be included. I recognize the problem, and I hope we may have the cooperation of the committee and of the interested Senators in solving it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. Has the Senator from Illinois concluded his colloquy on the subject he was discussing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, unless the Senator has a question on the point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; my question relates to another point.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, I should like to ask the chairman of the full committee a question with respect to the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, found on page 16, line 12. Approximately \$5 million more was asked than was allowed by the House. The Senate committee did not allow it, but referred the matter to the Director of the Budget for an opinion. May I ask the chairman if any reply has been received from the Director of the Budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that the matter was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, as the committee directed, but up to this moment there has been no reply from the Bureau. However, in my judgment, there will be another supplemental appropriation bill, and whether the budget reports favorably on the item or not, the committee will have an opportunity to pass on it when that bill is considered. So the matter can be considered a little later.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the matter was referred to the new Director of the Budget, in order to get an opinion from him, was it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. On page 18 of the bill, line 14, under the items aggregating \$1,200,000,000, apparently to be appropriated to make up an increase for the military forces, I read the following language:

The foregoing amounts under this heading to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation during the fiscal year 1953 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

I should like to ascertain from the distinguished chairman of the committee if the breakdown on page 22 of the report means that the action of the Senate in passing this bill today means reducing funds for the maintenance and operation of the Army by \$301 million; that we are taking away from the Air Force money for planes in the amount of \$295 million; that we are reducing the funds for the Marine Corps by \$40 million; the amount for ships and facilities of the Navy by \$83 million; the amount for ordnance

and facilities by \$57 million; the amount for medical care for troops by \$5,700,000; together with funds for other matters listed.

In other words, I should like to understand whether the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] today that a saving of more than a billion dollars is shown means that we are to eliminate funds for the acquisition of ships, ordnance, and aircraft, and for medical care, amounts which will not be restored later by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is my understanding that the Department of Defense and its respective divisions have gone over the figures with the staff of the Committee on Appropriations, and also with some members of the committee, and the Department has given assurance that the reductions can be absorbed without the loss of effectiveness of the defense effort, or a reduction of any of the essential aspects of the defense program. In other words, it is the understanding of the committee that the funds will not be replaced, and that the reductions can be absorbed without detrimentally affecting the defense program.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senate committee having cut \$295 million from Air Force funds, some \$40 million from Marine Corps funds, and some \$57 million from ordnance. I am at a loss to understand how we would save money, if when the appropriation bill for the armed services comes before the Senate, the \$57 million for ordnance, and the amounts for airplanes and other items, will come back through another door when the time comes to appropriate.

Mr. BRIDGES. No, it is the understanding of the committee that these amounts will not come back through another door, but that they are actual savings. For example, as a result of going into production in the manufacture or purchase of certain ordnance equipment, and therefore getting lower costs, the Department of Defense is able to achieve its objective at an amount lower than was requested in the previous appropriation bill. Therefore, the surplus can be used for this purpose and not detract from the original objective. That is our understanding.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is saying is that this is a rescission, and not an actual saving of money?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. Let me read a statement with respect to that question by Mr. Lyle S. Garlock, one of the top officials of the Department of Defense:

With respect to the method of financing proposed by the House, the Department does not object to financing the bill from funds available, but we do want to point out that it is still too early in the year to determine which appropriations can stand these transfers without any substantial interference with the military operations.

So if this committee agrees with the House action, and it is understood we are to take the money from those appropriations which will not cause any interference with the military buildup, we will concur. It is possible, Senator, that we might have to use some procurement money that would have to be replaced in later years.

He leaves an out for the future.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think he leaves an out; I think he leaves the door wide open, if this matter is to be handed to the Senate and to the country as a billion dollar saving.

I listened intently to the Senator as he read from the report, and I understood the witness to say it was far too early to tell just what portion of these rescissions or transfers or manipulations would be savings which could come back in the form of requests for appropriations in other bills. I am not so familiar with military needs as is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; but when the armed services appropriation bill comes before the Senate, I should certainly be very much surprised if the Department of Defense did not ask for more money. I find in the report that it is proposed to transfer \$57 million for ordnance facilities. Moreover, I certainly doubt that there is \$40 million of fat in the Marine Corps appropriation. I doubt very seriously whether there is \$83 million for ships that we can automatically wipe out and not have to replace.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, because I know that he wants to be fair, and that he is looking for the facts, that in my judgment there might very well be that amount of fat that can be taken out. It can easily be taken out. The information conveyed to our committee was that on June 30, 1952, there was approximately \$7 billion in completely unobligated funds.

I am in favor of adequate national defense, and have always been. Back in the 1930's, when many Members of this body were in favor of cutting down defense appropriations and closing their eyes to what was going on, I fought for appropriations for national defense. I have always been in favor of adequate national defense. However, I think there is a great deal of waste and duplication which could be eliminated, and I think this is one way of doing it.

I cannot say to the Senator absolutely that with respect to these items the Defense Department may not try to slip some items in by the back door again. I would not be foolish enough to say that it will not try to do so. But to the best of my knowledge and belief these savings can be absorbed, and I believe that the method proposed is the best way of policing the situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. The only thing that worries me is what the Senator has just read, to the effect that it is too early in the year to know. Now we are told that we are saving more than \$1 billion. As I read the bill we are not saving a thin dime. We are robbing Peter to pay Paul. We are meeting \$1,200,000,000 worth of pay due servicemen under increased allowances and pay.

On the other hand, we are proposing to rescind or transfer some \$1,043,000,000. However, the chairman of the committee does not say, and I do not believe he can say, whether in this action we are taking away, for example, \$28 million of civilian relief in Korea, or taking away from the Army some \$301

million. Certainly, if money which has been appropriated for the Army is not used by the end of this fiscal year it will still be available for the Army. So we would not have to appropriate so much money in the next defense bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. That depends on the type of the appropriation; some authorizations lapse in 1 year, some remain available until expended. Let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that often in the past there has been a rush by the departments to obligate and spend money before the deadline of June 30. I do not say that that has been true in all cases, but I do say that there has been such a general tendency in the Federal Government. If the Congress of the United States, exercising its duties in the field of appropriations, can force a department to use money previously appropriated to carry out an act without detriment to the general program, I think it is sound procedure to do so. Large balances of unobligated funds available to an agency are not conducive to tight economical operations. I do not think the Senator has any cause for worry. I have never heard of damage resulting by reason of a department of the Government voluntarily giving up money.

Mr. MONRONEY. The breakdown, I take it, is that which is recommended by the Department of Defense for ordnance, aircraft, ships, and other things which are not needed, and for which the Department will not need to seek new appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. The Senator will note items for retired pay, and a number of items for military personnel. The opportunity for savings arises because during the fiscal year there were not the number of men in the services contemplated when the request for appropriations was made last session.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have heard a great deal about ordnance shortages. I should not like to see the Senate take action which would cut \$57 million from the item of ordnance, which apparently is in this list.

Mr. BRIDGES. Where does the Senator see the item of ordnance?

Mr. MONRONEY. On page 23 of the committee report. There is an item of \$57,288,000 listed under "Ordnance and facilities." I cannot tell whether it is for the Marine Corps or the Navy, or both. In other words, the rescissions appear to me to come out of fighting funds, funds for military equipment, medical care, and things of that kind, which we have been led to believe are greatly needed, and represent a very important part of our national defense.

With a \$40 billion bill coming in later, I do not see how the Congress, and particularly the Senate, can tell whether or not such appropriation bill will carry the \$1 billion, which we save on March 2, and which we may find ourselves reappropriating in May, or whenever the bill comes to us.

Mr. BRIDGES. All I can say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is that the committee will do its best to see that these items are not reappropriated for through any back-door opera-

tion. We have approached at the problem in a sincere effort to attain economy, bearing in mind that no Defense Department official will be absolutely positive. Defense Department officials say "probably," and Congress must make the decision. I think the Defense Department officials went as far as they could in the hearings without the official approval of their superiors. We have had various conferences since. Prior to that time we convinced ourselves that this was an equitable method.

I think we must approach this problem from the standpoint that we must provide adequate national defense; but let us not by any means call national defense a sacred cow and say "hands off," because there is evidence that there is a great deal of waste and duplication in the Defense Department.

I assure the Senator from Oklahoma that we shall do everything we can to see that the defense agencies do not call for reappropriations. I assure the Senator from Oklahoma that to the best of our knowledge and belief, based upon our ability to get the facts, elimination of these funds will not cripple the defense effort. That is all I can say.

Mr. MONRONEY. Can the Senator also assure me that the so-called reductions of \$1 billion do not represent reductions in personnel, payroll, and things like that? Are they mostly reductions in money previously appropriated for equipment, planes, ships, or ordnance, representing items which have not yet been expended by the Defense Department?

Mr. BRIDGES. Generally speaking, I believe that is true. They are funds not needed, or not required now, due to changed conditions. There may be some exceptions. But so far as we can tell, this is an equitable procedure. It does not mean cutting corners in any way. We do not expect to have to make appropriations later because of our action in transferring funds today.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, there was testimony by Mr. Lyle S. Garlock, Deputy Comptroller, Office of the Secretary of Defense, to the effect that at least \$600 million of this money was not to be used and, if transferred, did not have to be replaced. His explanation was that in many cases estimates were made about a year ago which were somewhat greater than were necessary. In allocating appropriated money to various people, most of them had some left over, which makes up this sum. With respect to the \$600 million, I am sure the chairman can give assurance that it will not be necessary to replace that amount.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana himself asked the question, and received the positive answer that \$600 million absolutely would not be used.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. The committee and witnesses then proceeded to discuss the remainder of the items. If there is any question whatever, it applies to the re-

mainder of the items and not to the \$600 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3053) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE BUDGET OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Congress will consider in the near future the budget for the District of Columbia. In that connection, it will have to deal with a perennial problem—one that confronts every new session of Congress. The problem is this: How much should Congress appropriate as the share of the Federal Government toward the annual operating expenses of the District of Columbia?

Let me say, at the outset, that I am not now a member of the District Committee. I had the privilege of serving on that committee for 8 years. But my assignment to three other committees now precludes my serving on the committee under the able leadership of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. Nevertheless, during my tenure on the District of Columbia Committee I gained a deep concern for the problems of the District of Columbia. I have an abiding love for Washington—our National Capital. Always I shall stand ready to do whatever I can to preserve and develop it as the principal shrine of our people.

With this in mind I am compelled to bring to the attention of the Senate the serious financial condition of the District of Columbia. I have studied the matter carefully. I am convinced that Congress must take action if it is to maintain the financial stability of the municipal government. The demands for the services and facilities of the city government are greater than ever. In recent years—as Senators know—the Federal Government has undergone a tremendous expansion in Washington. The cost of operating the city has spiraled due to inflation.

In 1917 the total cost of running the city of Washington was about \$16 million. In 1945 the total cost had increased to \$70 million. And for the fiscal year 1952 the costs climbed to \$120 million. Despite these increased demands for services, and rising costs, the Federal

share of the city's operating expense has dwindled to only a fraction.

The record shows that the Federal payment has shrunk from 50 percent to 40 percent to 30 percent. At the present time it is less than 9 percent. This is the lowest Federal contribution toward the operating costs of the city of Washington in the history of our Nation.

The Federal payment is not a subsidy. It is not a grant-in-aid. Rather, it is a payment that the Federal Government owes to the municipal government for services performed during the year.

If we go into the history of the relations between the National Government and the city of Washington, we will find that the Federal payment has gone through four major phases.

During the first period, between 1790 and 1878, there was no fixed system for Federal payment. In some years there were lump sum payments and in other years there were no payments at all. But the average payment during this early period was about 25 percent of the city budget.

During the second period, from 1879 to 1921, the District of Columbia was on a 50-50 basis with the Federal Government. This fixed ratio payment, established in the Organic Act of 1878, lasted for more than 40 years.

The third period began in 1921 when Congress ignored the organic act and provided for a 40-60 basis of payment. The Federal Government paid 40 percent. The same plan was used in 1922. In 1923 the 40-60 ratio basis of payment was made permanent.

The final period in the history of the Federal payment began in 1925 when Congress adopted the present lump-sum payment system. The first lump-sum payment was for \$9 million, or about 30 percent of the city's expenses for that year. But during the period since 1925, and up to the present time, the Federal share has gone down from 30 percent to less than 9 percent.

Mr. President, throughout the years District officials and civic organizations have urged Congress to establish a definite policy of fair and regular Federal payments for the upkeep of our National Capital. But just as soon as Congress adopts a policy, as the record shows, it proceeds to ignore it and appropriates an arbitrary Federal share. This is often done without measuring the services it has obtained, or expects to obtain, from the District Government. The officials and residents of Washington cannot have any assurance, from year to year, as to what percentage of payment the Congress will allow toward the operating costs of the Nation's Capital.

Before I go into the necessity for a fixed policy, though, I think we ought to look at some of the causes that underlie the District's financial condition.

The first problem is the real estate or land situation in the District of Columbia.

As Senators know, the District of Columbia is an area that is fixed. It cannot expand. It can never reach out and annex new territory. The total land area of Washington, excluding the

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued Mar. 4, 1953
For actions of Mar. 3, 1953
3rd-1st, No. 36

CONTENTS

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Adjournment.....4 | Hawaii statehood.....2 | Roads.....1 |
| Appropriations.....1 | Inflation.....5 | St. Lawrence seaway.....10 |
| Contracts.....6 | Newsprint.....3 | Seed distribution.....11 |
| Electrification.....16 | Personnel.....9 | Soil conservation.....17 |
| Farm policy.....12 | Prices, farm.....13 | Trade, foreign.....14 |
| Flood control.....7 | Reclamation.....15 | Transportation.....8 |

HIGHLIGHTS: House send 2nd supplemental appropriation bill to conference. House committee reported Hawaii statehood bill.

HOUSE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Reps. Taber, Hinglesworth, Clevenger, Busbey, Cannon, Rooney, and Fogarty were appointed conferees on this bill, H. R. 3053 (p. 1626). Senate conferees were appointed Mar. 2. In addition to the Senate actions reported in Digest 35, the Senate increased the item for access roads to \$18,000,000 (House figure was \$8,000,000).
2. HAWAII STATEHOOD. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments H. R. 3575, to provide for statehood for Hawaii (H. Rept. 109) (p. 1658).
3. NEWSPRINT. The Rules Committee reported without amendment H. Res. 126, to direct the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate actual and contemplated action affecting production or consumption of newsprint (H. Rept. 93) (p. 1658).
4. ADJOURNED until Thurs., Mar. 5 (p. 1657).

BILLS INTRODUCED

5. INFLATION. H. R. 3633, by Rep. Barrett; H. R. 3651, by Rep. Buchanan; and H. R. 3657, by Rep. Powell; to control inflation; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 1658).
6. CONTRACTS. H. R. 3634, by Rep. Celler, to provide for a limited judicial review of decisions of Federal officers under finality clauses in Government contracts; to Judiciary Committee (p. 1658).
7. FLOOD CONTROL. H. R. 3645, by Rep. Scudder; to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Redwood Creek, Calif., for flood control; to Public Works Committee (p. 1658).
8. TRANSPORTATION. H. R. 3659, by Rep. Reed of N. Y., to extend until July 1, 1955,

the time during which personal and household effects brought into the U. S. under Government orders shall be exempt from duty; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 1659).

9. PERSONNEL. H. J. Res. 205, by Rep. Small, to unify severance pay to Federal employees; to Rules Committee (p. 1659).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

10. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Rep. Oakman inserted a letter from N. R. Danielian and a Washington Post editorial favoring this project (p. A1085).
11. SEED DISTRIBUTION. Rep. McDonough inserted a Pathfinder article describing how "Johnny Gardenseed" Mozier has distributed 200,000 packages of vegetable seeds in the South Pacific and the Far East. (pp. A1087-8).
12. FARM POLICY. Rep. Bentley inserted a Mich. Farm Bureau declaration supporting the "policies of the new administration" in USDA (pp. A1088-9).
13. FARM PRICES. Rep. Albert inserted a newspaper article discussing lowering farm prices and stating that the farmer is ready to listen if a better system than price supports can be found (p. A1096).
Rep. Cooley inserted a Quick magazine article discussing the economic improvement of Iowa farmers in the last 20 years and claiming Secretary Benson "sounded the death knell of this era" (pp. A1102-3).
Rep. Burdick inserted Pink Williams' statement claiming that overproduction and Government bungling have caused trouble for ranchers (pp. A1107-8).
14. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Smith, Miss., inserted a Christian Science Monitor interview with R. B. Frost favoring free trade (pp. A1097-8).
15. RECLAMATION. Rep. Metcalf inserted a newspaper article favoring repeal of the 160-acre land limit (p. A1107).
16. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Horan inserted Paul Raver's speech on the importance of electrification and outlining public utility responsibilities (p. A1112).
17. SOIL CONSERVATION. Rep. Cannon inserted a letter from Henry Blesi, a county PMA chairman, summarizing ACP practices in his county and favoring the program (p. A1115).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS, RELEASED BY G. P. O

18. HOUSING. National Housing Act amendment, H. J. Res. 160. H. Banking Committee.

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR MAR. 4: Agricultural appropriations, H. Appropriations (exec). S. Agriculture, committee business (exec). Legislative Reorganization Act amendments, S. Government Operations (exec). Treaties and executive agreements, S. Judiciary. Eklutna reclamation project, Alaska, H. Interior. Manpower utilization, H. Post Office and Civil Service (exec).

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Rm. 105A.



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 99

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1953

No. 36

Senate

Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 4, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. A. Ray Cartlidge, D. D., pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Champaign, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-present Father, as we start this session of duties and opportunities we know our need of strength in body, mind, and spirit. Alone we are not enough. All that we have comes from Thee and all that we shall become and do is governed by Thy grace. Send Thy spirit into us.

May Thy patience shown to mankind through the ages inspire us to a deeper patience toward the thoughtless, the ignorant, and the petty that press upon us.

May wisdom from Thee enable us to sift the truth from falsehood, justice from partisanship, and greatness from smallness; and thus enlightened may we have courage to do the better thing.

Grant unto us each an inner core of faith and trust that after we have done the best we know with these hours we may leave the rest with Thee in peace of heart and mind. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference

with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to act as Speaker pro tempore on Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

OFFICER PERSONNEL IN THE ARMED FORCES

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the action of the House last Wednesday in passing H. R. 2332, as temporary legislation relating to officer personnel in the Armed Forces, I rise to advise the House that next Thursday the Armed Forces Subcommittee on Personnel, of which I am privileged to be chairman, will begin hearings on this subject.

We intend to make a thorough study of the entire promotion program. We have already asked the respective services to furnish our committee with certain basic information. In order that the House may be advised as to our approach to this problem, that you may have assurances of thoroughness with which we will study this whole matter of promotion of officers, I am including as part of my remarks a statement I released to the press setting forth in detail the type of information we have requested and will review.

Inasmuch as much of the information we will study is of a classified nature, our committee will hold all hearings in executive session until further notice. It is

my best estimate that it will take approximately 4 weeks of hearings and concentrated work on the part of the committee to make this study. We will be thorough and wholly objective.

Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, Illinois, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee that will investigate the entire promotion program for officers of the Armed Forces, announced today that hearings will begin on Thursday, March 5, 1953.

Mr. ARENDS said that due to the classified nature of much of the information to be submitted to the subcommittee all hearings would be in executive session until further notice.

Representative ARENDS stated that he had asked each service to submit full justification for each job now occupied by a flag or general officer in each of the Armed Forces. He said the services have also been asked to submit the names of all flag and general officers, their ages, rank, permanent grades, and their present temporary grades.

Mr. ARENDS said: "The services will also be asked to submit information concerning the billet justification for all colonels now serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, together with a comparison of the permanent grades of these officers and the temporary grades in which they are now serving."

Other information which will be sought by the subcommittee involves the total number of officers now serving on active duty in each grade, compared with the total number of officers each service feels necessary to man properly the Armed Forces.

Mr. ARENDS revealed the nature of the legislation his subcommittee would possibly consider by explaining that each service has been asked to submit a suggested percentage distribution of officers based on the total number of officers on active duty, graduated downward as the total number of officers on active duty increases. He said that this information would be studied by the subcommittee to determine whether it is possible to place percentage limitations on temporary promotions during periods of emergency such as now exist when the enlisted and officer strengths far exceed the authorized regular strengths.

THREE-CENT BUS FARE FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN

(Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of the House Committee on the District of Columbia is to pass on legislation for the District.

As chairman of the committee, I was asked to introduce legislation repealing the Capital Transit Co.'s 3-cent fare for school children.

It was explained to me at the time that legislation of this kind was pending in another legislative body, which also deals with District of Columbia legislation.

The 3-cent school children's fare was established by Public Law 733, 71st Congress, February 25, 1931; therefore it takes legislation to repeal it.

I am informed there are 9,000,000 3-cent school fares annually. If this amount were doubled to 6 cents it would mean \$270,000 additional revenue annually for the Capital Transit Co. The 1952 earnings failed to meet dividends by \$297,000. Rather significant but true.

From the way the Capital Transit Co. is obtaining rate increases and declaring dividends with war time profits, they apparently now see another opportunity to grab from school children. Three cents today is a cheap price for anything. Regardless, this company under present management is not going to get any help from me and I hope from the District of Columbia Committee in taking one cent from school children under such circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to publicly state that I will not introduce such legislation in this body. If such is introduced, I will oppose it in the subcommittee. I will oppose it in the full committee and on the House floor if it gets that far, which I doubt.

Such is my position on this request and proposal as long as the present ownership of Capital Transit is maintained.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat that I feel the District of Columbia Committee is one of legislation.

I think it past time that someone in proper authority let the Capital Transit Co. know that the District of Columbia, the Congress, and the country are not going to be pushed around any longer by them.

As chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, I can make a start by opposing the legislation just mentioned.

Furthermore, I believe it should be publicly called to attention.

The present ownership may be within the law in buying control of the Capital Transit Co. at \$20 per share, only to receive it back in dividends in 4 years.

The North American Co. may have been within their rights, when upon being ordered by the Security and Exchange Commission to divest themselves of their Capital Transit stock, including the several million dollars cash "sleeper" they did so. Then the wolf gang cashed in on it.

The stockholders of the North American Co. could well wonder why they did not participate in dividends rather than

their management let the Wolfson group grab the "sleeper." This would be interesting to know from many angles.

If all of this is within the law, then the law should be amended before it is too late. Government workers, Washington business concerns, professions, banks, and the Congress have a vital interest in public transportation in the Nation's Capital.

If new legislation stopping this so-called legalized dissipation of the Capital's transportation system is what will stop it, then I am willing to introduce it. The District of Columbia Committee will seek legal advice of the Corporation Counsel on it. If punitive legislation is needed—and I am willing to call it that in the public interest—I hope the Corporation Counsel, the new Chairman of the Utilities Commission, and the District Commissioners will soon come up with it either to the District of Columbia or the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

They might just as well come now because the battle is on. If the present method of milking the surplus of the Capital Transit Co. and the public is not stopped in the not too distant future, they will, in my opinion, appear, asking for help sooner or later, regardless.

Last year, a distinguished Illinois citizen came up with this old English statement which seems to apply to the Capital Transit Co.:

The law locks up both man and woman, who steals the goose from the common; but lets the greater felon loose who steals the common from the goose.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone over my remarks with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], who is chairman of the District Subcommittee on Public Utilities, Insurance, and Banking. He has approved what I have said. The press has taken a public interest in the matter. I am trying to make a feeble contribution. I believe if something is not done, and soon, the District and the Congress are going to have something on their hands that will cost them millions.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, approximately what the difference is between the two Houses?

Mr. TABER. It runs to probably \$25 million or \$30 million.

Mr. CANNON. Is that an increase or decrease with relation to the House figures?

Mr. TABER. Oh, the usual.

Mr. CANNON. Is there a proposal on the part of the other body to decrease any item in the House bill?

Mr. TABER. There was one, an item for the transfer of \$1 million out of funds of the so-called Voice of America item.

Mr. CANNON. The proposition of the gentleman is to insist on all other House figures?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, CLEVINGER, BUSBEY, CANNON, ROONEY, and FOGARTY.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the other special orders.

REREFERENCE OF BILLS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3350) for the relief of Ralston Edward Harry, and the bill (H. R. 3276) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan, and that these bills be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I also ask that I may have inserted as part of my remarks a letter from General Gray explaining that the \$600,000 was not taken from any hospital beds, but from a fund that the budget had impounded; so it did not mean the taking away of any hospital beds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

ALLEN PHILLIPS

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege and with great pride that I watched Allen Phillips, of Lincoln, Mass., a young constituent of mine, receive the award of a Westinghouse scholarship of \$2,800 that will enable him to continue his work in science.

The boy is 15 years old and graduates from high school in June of this year. They told me last night that he has the brain of a very much older individual. Two of the scientists there told me they thought that in later years he would have the finest scientific mind in the

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued Mar. 13, 1953
For actions of Mar. 12, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 43

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Adjournment.....8 | Food Reserve.....12 | Personnel.....14 |
| Alaska.....15 | Foreign aid.....3 | Price Supports.....3 |
| Appropriations.....1 | Hawaii.....15 | Reorganization.....2,13 |
| Buildings.....11 | Health.....17 | Retirement.....14 |
| Butter.....3 | Import controls.....9 | Roads, access.....1 |
| Cotton production.....5,16 | Lands, public.....10 | Taxation.....6 |
| Economic advisers.....1 | Leave payments.....4 | Telephones, rural.....1 |
| Electrification, rural...1 | Minerals.....10 | TVA.....7 |
| Emergency fund.....1 | | |

HIGHLIGHTS: Conferees reported 2nd supplemental appropriation bill with REA item in disagreement. Rep. Whitten defended 90% price supports on basics but criticized such supports on butter. House received reorganization plan to create Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HOUSE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Received the conference report on H. R. 3053 (pp. 1964-5). The conferees agreed to \$13,000,000 for access roads (House figure, \$8,000,000; Senate figure, \$13,000,000). The provision transferring \$15,000,000 of the REA loan authorization from rural electrification to rural telephones was reported in disagreement. An item of \$50,000 was included for an economic adviser, and staff, to the President, instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House and \$60,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers as proposed by the Senate. The Senate figure of \$250,000 was included as an Emergency Fund for the President instead of the House figure of \$75,000. The bill also includes items for Federal-aid highways, veterans' readjustment benefits, investigations of U. S. citizens employed by international organizations, education in areas where large numbers of Federal employees reside, and payments of claims against the Government.
2. REORGANIZATION. Received from the President a reorganization plan to create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in lieu of the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. 102); to Government Operations Committee (pp. 1965-7).
3. PRICE SUPPORTS; FOREIGN AID. Rep. Whitten defended price supports at 90% of parity on basic agricultural commodities, criticized price supports at this level on butter, and defended his amendment to the foreign-aid bill last year (p. 1987).
4. LEAVE PAYMENTS. Rep. Curtis, Mo., criticized terminal leave payments to former Government officials (p. 1967).
5. COTTON PRODUCTION. Rep. Hunter commended the development of cotton production in Calif. (pp. 1967-8).
Rep. Brooks, La., recommended additional funds for pink bollworm control (pp. 1968-9).

6. TAXATION. Rep. Reed, N. Y., spoke in favor of H. R. 1, his tax-cut bill (pp. 1977-81).
7. TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY. Rep. Cooper commended this program (pp. 1981-3).
8. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 16 (p. 1988). Next week's program, as announced by Majority Whip Arends: Mon., Consent Calendar and conference report on second supplemental appropriation bill; Tues., Private Calendar; Wed., reorganization plan for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; conference reports at any time (p. 1968).

SENATE

Conducted no business, because of lack of a quorum.

BILLS INTRODUCED

9. IMPORT CONTROLS. H. R. 3910, by Rep. Bailey, to amend Sec. 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to provide for the imposition of import controls, upon petition by domestic producers adversely affected by priorities and allocation controls imposed under such section; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 1988).
10. PUBLIC LANDS. H. R. 3915, by Rep. Engle, to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 1988).
11. BUILDINGS. H. R. 3918, by Rep. Hays, Ark., to authorize a program for construction of county agricultural buildings to house Federal, State, and local offices engaged in agricultural programs; to Agriculture Committee (p. 1988).
12. FOOD RESERVE. H. J. Res. 224, by Rep. Smith, Miss., providing for an International Food Reserve; to Foreign Affairs Committee (p. 1989).
13. REORGANIZATION. H. J. Res. 223, by Rep. Hoffman, Mich., providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after enactment of the measure; to Government Operations Committee (p. 1989).
14. PERSONNEL. H. R. 3935-3949, by Rep. Lesinski, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in various respects; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 1989).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

15. HAWAII; ALASKA. Extension of remarks of Rep. Miller (Neb.) in favor of H. R. 3575, to provide for statehood for Hawaii, and stating that hearings on bills for statehood for Alaska have been arranged for April 14 through 17 (pp. A1334-5).
Rep. Holtzman inserted a New York Times editorial urging statehood for Hawaii (pp. A1335-6).
16. COTTON PRODUCTION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hagen pointing out California's "position of eminence in cotton production" (p. A1339).
17. HEALTH. Rep. Javits inserted a New York Herald Tribune editorial in favor of the national health program sponsored by Sen. Ives, Rep. Javits, and others (p. A1365).

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

MARCH 12, 1953.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. TABER, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3053]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 28, 35, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 21, 23, 26, 29, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 45, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings", \$800.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *, to remain available until expended, \$13,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant*

to the contract authority granted by the Act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422); and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, \$50,000.

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 42.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

- Amendment No. 1: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.
- Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.
- Amendment No. 3: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.
- Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: Permit payment of existing funds to additional employees in offices of Senators from Florida and New Jersey, as proposed by the Senate.
- Amendment No. 6: Reported in disagreement.
- Amendment No. 7: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.
- Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement.
- Amendment No. 9: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate funds for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.
- Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.
- Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$500,000 for Senate inquiries and investigations, as proposed by the Senate.
- Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement.
- Amendments Nos. 13 and 14: Insert titles, as proposed by the Senate.
- Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$800 for Capitol Buildings, instead of \$3,651 as proposed by the Senate.
- Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement.
- Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$54,000 for Senate Office Building, as proposed by the Senate.
- Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

- Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

- Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$130,000 for salaries and expenses of the Patent Office, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House.

~~Amendment~~ Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$13,000,000 for access roads, instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 23: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IV

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$80,000 for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Employment Security, as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 28: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to increase the limitation for expenses of technical services for school construction.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Amendment No. 29: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 30, 31, and 32: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 33: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 34: Changes chapter number, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 35: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to waive the prohibition in Public Law 470, 82d Congress, against the purchase of land. The conferees on the part of both Houses recognize the desirability of accomplishing the purposes of the amendment but it was felt that the cost of the land to be acquired should receive further consideration. The conferees instruct the Bureau of Indian Affairs that any funds allocated for the purposes contemplated by this amendment shall be held until the matter can be reviewed in subsequent hearings.

Amendment No. 36: Changes chapter number, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VII

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$50,000 for an economic adviser, and staff, to the President, instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House and \$60,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$250,000 for the emergency fund for the President as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$75,000 as proposed by the House.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for grants to the Republic of the Philippines, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 40 and 41: Change chapter numbers, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 43, 44, and 45: Change chapter and section numbers, as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,

Managers on the Part of the House.



House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, wilt Thou kindle within our souls Thy divine light and may its luster and radiance never grow dim or be eclipsed and extinguished as we daily continue our earthly pilgrimage.

We humbly confess that there is so much in life that appears dark unto us and that we do not understand. Again and again our finite minds are sorely perplexed with questions we cannot answer and with problems which human ingenuity and wisdom cannot solve.

Grant that we may never lose heart or hope but go right onward in one undeviating course, following the leading of Thy spirit and that light that shall never fail.

Show us how we may conquer our fears and doubts. Help us to cleave with increasing tenacity to Thy love which will never let us go. May we place our trembling hands in Thine and heed Thy voice as Thou dost say, "This is the way, walk ye therein."

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord in whom we find that perfect love which casts out all fear. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House, by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 11, 1953:

H. R. 1979. An act to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955.

On February 14, 1953:

H. R. 568. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

On March 10, 1953:

H. R. 2230. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitations on official long-distance telephone calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the fol-

lowing title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 697. An act to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 91):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOSEPH R. BRAYSON, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the above resolution, Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina were appointed on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that J. Mark Trice, of Maryland, be appointed a member of the Federal Records Council, vice Leslie L. Biffle.

EXTENDING FOR AN ADDITIONAL 2 YEARS THE EXISTING PRIVILEGE OF FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3658) to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of December 5, 1942, entitled "An act to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad," as amended (U. S. C., title 50, App., sec. 847), is hereby amended by striking out "July 1, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1955."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 3658, which was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, is to continue for an additional 2 years the existing law which allows for the entry of so much of any

shipment of bona fide gifts as does not exceed \$50 in value without the payment of customs duties, charges, or exactions, or internal revenue taxes when such gifts are sent by members of the Armed Forces on duty abroad.

Existing law expires July 1, 1953.

The act of December 5, 1942 (Public Law 790, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 1041), allowed, until the expiration of 6 months after the termination of hostilities as determined by proclamation of the President, the entry, free of customs duties or internal revenue import taxes, of so much of any shipment as did not exceed \$50 in value if there were filed in connection with the entry satisfactory evidence that the articles were bona fide gifts from a member of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty outside the continental limits of the United States. Public Law 384 of the 80th Congress extended the period for free entry through June 30, 1949, and also amended the law by restricting the privileges so as to deny free entry on or after September 1, 1947, unless the article is purchased "in or through authorized agencies of the Armed Forces of the United States or in accordance with regulations prescribed by the major geographical commands of the United States Armed Forces."

This law was extended without interruption by the 81st and 82d Congresses.

The Bureau of Customs has advised your committee that it has encountered no serious administrative difficulties in administering this law, and it was explained to your committee that this legislation is safeguarded from abuse not only by the restrictions imposed by Public Law 384 of the 80th Congress, but also by appropriate Treasury Department regulations and instructions from the armed services.

Your committee believes that this limited free importation privilege is a definite moral factor for our servicemen overseas, and since substantial numbers are now stationed in all parts of the world, a 2-year extension is warranted.

The Department of Defense has requested that this legislation be made permanent. Your committee believes that a 2-year extension will accomplish the desired result and that at the end of that period the Congress can determine if an additional extension is desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported by unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means and we strongly support its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING UNTIL JULY 1, 1955, THE PERIOD DURING WHICH PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS BROUGHT INTO THE UNITED STATES UNDER GOVERNMENT ORDERS SHALL BE EXEMPT FROM DUTY

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3659) to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 2 of the act of June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders" (U. S. C., title 50 App., sec. 802), is hereby amended to read as follows: "This act shall be effective with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after December 8, 1941, and before July 1, 1955."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (18) of subsection (a) of the first section of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82 Cong.) is hereby repealed.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 3659, which was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, is to continue to July 1, 1955, the existing law which allows the exemption from duty of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

The existing law expires April 1, 1953. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that this bill be sent to the other body without delay. If the present law is permitted to lapse, it will cause serious inconvenience and hardship on those persons in the service of the United States stationed overseas and who are ordered back to this country.

The act of June 27, 1942—Public Law 633, 77th Congress; Fifty-sixth Statutes, page 461—allowed, until the day following the proclamation of peace by the President, the free entry of personal and household effects of any person evacuated into the United States under Government orders.

Public Law 450 of the 82d Congress, extending the period of free entry, will expire April 1, 1953. The proposed legislation will continue this free-entry privilege to July 1, 1955.

This authority applies to the personal and household effects of any person in the service of the United States, or of his family, which are forwarded to the United States by reason of Government instructions regarding the movement of the owner of the article, whether or not the owner returns to this country.

The international obligations and commitments of the United States continue to require the presence of substantial numbers of persons in the service of the United States in many parts of the world. Termination of this free-

entry authority would impose an inequitable administrative burden upon persons evacuated to the United States and would remove an important morale factor and inducement to overseas service.

Your committee is advised by the Bureau of the Customs that no serious administrative difficulty has been encountered under the law. The exercise of the free-entry privilege is safeguarded from abuse by appropriate regulations of the Department of the Treasury, as required by the act.

The Department of Defense has requested that this legislation be made permanent. Your committee believes that an extension to July 1, 1955, will accomplish the desired result, and the Congress can at that time determine if an additional extension is desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was also reported by unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means, and we strongly urge its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL BILL, 1953

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 3053 may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, the intention is then to file tonight in order to permit us to take it up and dispose of it tomorrow?

Mr. TABER. As I understand, if we have a session tomorrow, we will try to dispose of it, but I do not understand they will have a session tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that arrangements have been made to adjourn over and not have a session tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. But this will permit us to take it up on Monday just as soon as the House meets.

As far as I am concerned, I would be glad to take it up tomorrow, but as I understand, the House has not planned to meet tomorrow, and for that reason it would not be possible to take it up until Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume it will be Monday. Of course, Tuesday is St. Patrick's Day, and some of us are interested in the celebration of that great event. I assume there will be no roll call, as far as the gentleman knows. Of course, he cannot control that.

Mr. TABER. I would not want to say that there would not be any, because I do not know in what shape things might develop, but I would hope that there would be none. If it is desired, I would not mind holding it a day or two after-

ward. I would not want to embarrass those who were paying their respects to St. Patrick by forcing a roll call on that day.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not the intention of the gentleman himself, in all probability, to ask for a roll call?

Mr. TABER. No; I would not expect to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 158)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 28, 35, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 21, 23, 26, 29, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 45, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for 'Capitol Buildings', \$800."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "to remain available until expended, \$13,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted by the Act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert:

"THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, \$50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 42.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of

the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Legislative Branch

Amendment No. 1: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 4 and 5: Permit payment of existing funds to additional employees in offices of Senators from Florida and New Jersey, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate funds for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$500,000 for Senate inquiries and investigations, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments No. 13 and 14: Insert titles, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$800 for Capitol Buildings, instead of \$3,651 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$54,000 for Senate Office Building, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER II

Department of State

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$130,000 for salaries and expenses of the Patent Office, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$13,000,000 for access roads, instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III

Post Office Department

Amendment No. 23: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 24 and 25: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IV

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$80,000 for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Employment Security, as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Security Agency

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 28: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to increase the limitation for expenses of technical services for school construction.

National Mediation Board

Amendment No. 29: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 30, 31 and 32: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER V

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 33: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 34: Changes chapter number, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 35: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to waive the prohibition in Public Law 470, 82nd Congress, against the purchase of land. The conferees on the part of both Houses recognize the desirability of accomplishing the purposes of the amendment but it was felt that the cost of the land to be acquired should receive further consideration. The conferees instruct the Bureau of Indian Affairs that any funds allocated for the purposes contemplated by this amendment shall be held until the matter can be reviewed in subsequent hearings.

Amendment No. 36: Changes chapter number, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VII

Executive Office of the President

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$50,000 for an economic adviser, and staff, to the President, instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House and \$60,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$250,000 for the Emergency Fund for the President as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$75,000 as proposed by the House.

Veterans' Administration

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for grants to the Republic of the Philippines, as proposed by the House.

Amendments No. 40 and 41: Change chapter numbers, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments No. 43, 44 and 45: Change chapter and section numbers, as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN TABER,

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

CLIFF CLEVINGER,

FRED E. BUSBEY,

CLARENCE CANNON,

JOHN J. ROONEY,

JOHN E. FOGARTY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, 1953— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

In my message of February 2, 1953, I stated that I would send to the Congress a reorganization plan defining a new administrative status for Federal activities in health, education, and social security. This plan carries out that intention by

creating a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as one of the executive departments of the Government and by transferring to it the various units of the Federal Security Agency. The Department will be headed by a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who will be assisted by an Under Secretary and two Assistant Secretaries.

The purpose of this plan is to improve the administration of the vital health, education, and social security functions now being carried on in the Federal Security Agency by giving them departmental rank. Such action is demanded by the importance and magnitude of these functions, which affect the well-being of millions of our citizens. The programs carried on by the Public Health Service include, for example, the conduct and promotion of research into the prevention and cure of such dangerous ailments as cancer and heart disease. The Public Health Service also administers payments to the States for the support of their health services and for urgently needed hospital construction. The Office of Education collects, analyzes and distributes to school administrators throughout the country information relating to the organization and management of educational systems. Among its other functions is the provision of financial help to school districts burdened by activities of the United States Government. State assistance to the aged, the blind, the totally disabled, and dependent children is heavily supported by grants-in-aid administered through the Social Security Administration. The old-age and survivors insurance system and child development and welfare programs are additional responsibilities of that administration. Other offices of the Federal Security Agency are responsible for the conduct of Federal vocational rehabilitation programs and for the enforcement of food and drug laws.

There should be an unrelenting effort to improve those health, education, and social security programs which have proved their value. I have already recommended the expansion of the social security system to cover persons not now protected, the continuation of assistance to school districts whose population has been greatly increased by the expansion of defense activities, and the strengthening of our food and drug laws.

But good intent and high purpose are not enough; all such programs depend for their success upon efficient, responsible administration. I have recently taken action to assure that the Federal Security Administrator's views are given proper consideration in executive councils by inviting her to attend meetings of the Cabinet. Now the establishment of the new Department provided for in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 will give the needed additional assurance that these matters will receive the full consideration they deserve in the whole operation of the Government.

This need has long been recognized. In 1923, President Harding proposed a Department of Education and Welfare, which was also to include health functions. In 1924, the Joint Committee on

Reorganization recommended a new department similar to that suggested by President Harding. In 1932, one of President Hoover's reorganization proposals called for the concentration of health, education, and recreational activities in a single executive department. The President's Committee on Administrative Management in 1937 recommended the placing of health, education, and social security functions in a Department of Social Welfare. This recommendation was partially implemented in 1939 by the creation of the Federal Security Agency—by which action the Congress indicated its approval of the grouping of these functions in a single agency. A new department could not be proposed at that time because the Reorganization Act of 1939 prohibited the creation of additional executive departments. In 1949, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government proposed the creation of a department for social security and education.

The present plan will make it possible to give the officials directing the Department titles indicative of their responsibilities and salaries comparable to those received by their counterparts in other executive departments. As the under secretary of an executive department, the Secretary's principal assistant will be better equipped to give leadership in the Department's organization and management activities, for which he will be primarily responsible. The plan opens the way to further administrative improvement by authorizing the Secretary to centralize services and activities common to the several agencies of the Department. It also establishes a uniform method of appointment for the heads of the three major constituent agencies. At present, the Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Education are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, while the Commissioner for Social Security is appointed by the Federal Security Administrator. Hereafter, all three will be Presidential appointees subject to Senate confirmation.

I believe, and this plan reflects my conviction, that these several fields of Federal activity should continue within the framework of a single department. The plan at the same time assures that the Office of Education and the Public Health Service retain the professional and substantive responsibilities vested by law in those agencies or in their heads. The Surgeon General, the Commissioner of Education, and the Commissioner of Social Security will all have direct access to the Secretary.

There should be in the Department an Advisory Committee on Education, made up of persons chosen by the Secretary from outside the Federal Government, which would advise the Secretary with respect to the educational programs of the Department. I recommend the enactment of legislation authorizing the defrayal of the expenses of this committee. The creation of such a committee as an advisory body to the Secretary will help ensure the maintenance of responsibility for the public educational system in State and local governments while

preserving the national interest in education through appropriate Federal action.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that by reason of these reorganizations, it is necessary to include in the reorganization plan provisions for the appointment and compensation of the new officers specified in sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the reorganization plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are, respectively, those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

Although the effecting of the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not in itself result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will in the future allow the performance of necessary services at greater savings than present operations would permit. An itemization of these savings in advance of actual experience is not practicable.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 12, 1953.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1953

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, March 12, 1953, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949, as amended)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

SECTION 1. Creation of Department; Secretary: There is hereby established an executive department, which shall be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereafter in this reorganization plan referred to as the Department). There shall be at the head of the Department a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereafter in this reorganization plan referred to as the Secretary), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments. The Department shall be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

SEC. 2. Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries: There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and two Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall perform such functions as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, respectively, of executive departments. The Under Secretary (or, during the absence or disability of the Under Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act as Secretary during the absence or disability of the Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Secretary.

SEC. 3. Special Assistant: There shall be in the Department a Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs) who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate

from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field with wide non-governmental experience, shall review the health and medical programs of the Department and advise the Secretary with respect to the improvement of such programs and with respect to necessary legislation in the health and medical fields, and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments.

SEC. 4. Commissioner of Social Security: There shall be in the Department a Commissioner of Social Security who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall perform such functions concerning social security and public welfare as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter fixed by law for grade GS-18 of the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 5. Transfers to the Department: All functions of the Federal Security Administrator are hereby transferred to the Secretary. All agencies of the Federal Security Agency, together with their respective functions, personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available), and all other functions, personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available) of the Federal Security Agency are hereby transferred to the Department.

SEC. 6. Performance of functions of the Secretary: The Secretary may from time to time make such provisions as the Secretary deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of the functions of the Secretary by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department.

SEC. 7. Administrative services: In the interest of economy and efficiency the Secretary may from time to time establish central administrative services in the fields of procurement, budgeting, accounting, personnel, library, legal, and other services and activities common to the several agencies of the Department; and the Secretary may effect such transfers within the Department of the personnel employed, the property and records used or held, and the funds available for use in connection with such administrative service activities as the Secretary may deem necessary for the conduct of any services so established: *Provided*, That no professional or substantive function vested by law in any officer shall be removed from the jurisdiction of such officer under this section.

SEC. 8. Abolitions: The Federal Security Agency (exclusive of the agencies thereof transferred by section 5 of this reorganization plan), the officers of Federal Security Administrator and Assistant Federal Security Administrator created by Reorganization Plan No. 1 (53 Stat. 1423), the two offices of assistant heads of the Federal Security Agency created by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946 (60 Stat. 1095), and the office of Commissioner for Social Security created by section 701 of the Social Security Act, as amended (64 Stat. 558), are hereby abolished. The Secretary shall make such provisions as may be necessary in order to wind up any outstanding affairs of the Agency and offices abolished by this section which are not otherwise provided for in this reorganization plan.

SEC. 9. Interim provisions: The President may authorize the persons who immediately prior to the time this reorganization plan takes effect occupy the offices of Federal Security Administrator, Assistant Federal Security Administrator, assistant heads of the Federal Security Agency, and Commissioner for Social Security to act as Secretary, Under Secretary, and Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare and as Commissioner of Social Security, respectively,

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued Mar. 20, 1953

For actions of Mar. 19, 1953

83rd-1st, No. 48

CONTENTS

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| Adjournment..... | 2 | Foreign trade..... | 5 | Reorganization..... | 6 |
| Appropriations..... | 1 | Forestry..... | 8 | Telephones, rural..... | 1 |
| Butter..... | 9 | Library Services..... | 4 | Transportation..... | 7 |
| Electrification, rural..... | 1 | Personnel..... | 3 | | |

HIGHLIGHT: Agreed to conference report on supplemental appropriation bill and disagreed to amendment on REA.

HOUSE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3053. (For items, see Digest 43.) Rejected, 165-191, a Taber motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment regarding REA with an amendment increasing the authorization for rural-telephone loans by \$10,000,000 instead of \$15,000,000 as provided in the Senate amendment. Also rejected, 171-174, a Whitten amendment increasing the authorization for rural-telephone loans by \$10,000,000 but making no change in the current authorization for rural-electrification loans. Then insisted on disagreement to the Senate amendment, which would increase the authorization for rural-telephone loans by \$15,000,000 and reduce the authorization for rural-electrification loans by \$15,000,000. (pp. 2197-2203.)

2. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 23 (p. 2210).

BILLS INTRODUCED

3. PERSONNEL. H. R. 4120, by Rep. Hagen, Minn., to direct the Civil Service Commission to study the classification and rates of technical, scientific, and engineering positions; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 2212).
4. LIBRARY SERVICES. H. R. 4124, to promote further development of public library service in rural areas; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 2212).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

5. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Frelinghuysen inserted a Fortune magazine article, "Free Trade Is Inevitable," which includes recommendations for the agricultural field (pp. A1473-5).

Rep. Lane inserted a speech by Gordon Graham, National Association of Wool Manufacturers, opposing trade agreements (pp. A1487-8).

Rep. Smith (Miss.) inserted three newspaper editorials urging repeal of the Buy American Act in order to encourage world trade (pp. A1494-5).

6. REORGANIZATION. Rep. Mason inserted a Washington Times-Herald editorial opposing Reorganization Plan No. 1 (pp. A1477-8).
Extension of remarks by Rep. Miller (Neb.) favoring, and Rep. Harris (Ark.) opposing, this Plan (pp. A1478, 1497-8).
7. TRANSPORTATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Wolverton stating that the Transportation Association of America has published a report making recommendations for a national transportation policy (p. A1480).
8. FORESTRY. Rep. Long inserted his radio address discussing H. R. 2725, his bill providing for sale of certain lands in the Kisatchie National Forest (pp. A1491-2).
9. BUTTER. Extension of remarks of Rep. Oakman urging the Secretary to dispose of surplus butter to the armed services (pp. A1493-4).

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR MAR. 20: Import controls on dairy products, H. Agriculture. Agricultural appropriations for 1954, H. Appropriations (exec).

-O-

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105A.

-O-



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 99

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 1953

No. 48

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, March 20, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art man's infallible counselor and faithful friend, may the memory of Thy sustaining presence in all our yesterdays inspire us to meet the adventure of each new day with faith and fortitude.

Show us how we may keep our moral balance and our loyalty to the spiritual ideals in these days when we are severely tempted to become infatuated with materialistic habits of life.

Grant that as individuals and as a nation we may be eager to do Thy will for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

Hear us in the name of the great Captain of our salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1078. An act to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, in connection with certain pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel; and

S. 1110. An act to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

(Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 12, 1953.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is signed by all the conferees.

The House estimates were \$2,313,719,590. The House passed the bill at \$925,172,920. The Senate estimates were \$2,327,521,114. The bill passed the Senate at \$947,325,579.

The conference agreement, including the items in dispute, is \$943,298,728. There is one rescission of \$1,000,000 in the bill, and there are two items of \$1,000,000 that the conferees agreed to the Senate amendments on that go out.

After the conference report is agreed to, and I know of no opposition to the report, it is my purpose to ask unanimous consent that certain amendments that have been agreed on by the conferees and which are absolutely noncontroversial be considered en bloc.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out at this time that the House conferees were in unanimous agreement on this conference report, and that your

House conferees have obtained the best possible settlement it was possible to obtain with the Senate conferees. An appropriations conference is all a matter of give and take, a matter of compromise. Further I might say that the bill, as passed in the other body, was \$22,152,659 more than the amount passed by the House. Of course, there were estimates submitted to the other body which had not been submitted to or considered by the House. These additional estimates totaled \$13,801,524. The amount now before the House in this conference report for your consideration is \$18,115,808 more than the amount originally passed by the House in this second supplemental appropriation bill for 1953 fiscal year.

One further matter: Amendment No. 33 on page 13 pertaining to the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture is reported back to the House in disagreement. An amendment will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to recede and concur with an amendment to reduce the figure \$40,000,000 on the last line of the Senate language and figures, to \$35,000,000. The effect would be to increase loan authorizations for the rural telephone program from \$25 million to \$35 million and decrease loan authorizations for the rural electrification program from \$50 million to \$35 million. As one who has always supported REA over the years, I would not have agreed to the decrease in the rural electrification loan program authorization if it were not for the fact that we received assurance in writing from Mr. Ralph Robers, budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, that—

Inasmuch as a loan program of \$165 million was planned and approved by the Congress for the fiscal year 1953, there will be an unused balance of \$32,298,000 in loan funds as of June 30, 1953.

The conferees have further been assured that the transfer of \$15 million from the electrification-loan program to the telephone-loan program will not have the effect of reducing the electrification-loan program in the current fiscal. On such assurances I shall support the amendment which will later be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. In regard to amendment No. 33, I have conferred with our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] who heads the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture. He had prepared what amounts to a substitute amendment, but unfortunately he has to be out of town today on official business which was set when it was thought this matter would be up yesterday. I agreed with him that we would oppose the conference report in that regard and offer a substitute provision and in his absence I would present the matter.

I will appreciate such time as might be needed to present our side of this matter to the House.

Mr. TABER. That amendment is not in the conference report. It is reported in disagreement and motions will be made at that time, and at that time I will yield time to the gentleman if he so desires.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with what I said prior to the adoption of the conference report, I ask unanimous consent that the House consider en bloc those amendments which are in technical disagreement and upon which the conference has agreed to recede and concur in the Senate amendments as follows:

Amendments Nos. 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 30, 31, 32, and 42.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Amendment No. 2: Page 1, line 10, insert: "For payment to Rosemary T. McMahon, widow of Brien McMahon, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, \$12,500."

Amendment No. 6: Page 2, line 22, insert: "Office of the Secretary: Effective March 1, 1953, the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953 is made available for the compensation of 1 camera and sound engineer, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of \$4,080 per annum, and 1 shipping clerk, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of \$1,500 per annum."

Amendment No. 8: Page 3, line 6, insert:

"Joint Committee on Printing: For an additional amount for salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing, at rates to be fixed by the committee, \$555."

Amendment No. 10: Page 3, line 17, insert: "Vice President's automobile: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, \$980."

Amendment No. 12: Page 4, line 7, insert: "Salaries, officers and employees

"Office of the Clerk: For an additional amount for the 'Office of the Clerk', \$3,835 to be available for the compensation of one editor and laboratory supervisor, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of \$4,020 per annum, and one script writer and general secretary, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of \$2,500 per annum, Joint Recording Facility."

Amendment No. 16: Page 5, line 19, insert: "Senate Restaurant: For repairs, improvements, furnishings and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Capitol Building, including personal and other services, \$1,600, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended."

Amendment No. 18: Page 6, line 4, insert:

"SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

"Preparation of rules for civil procedure

"For expenses of the Supreme Court incident to proposed amendments or additions to the rules of civil procedure for the United States district courts pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2072, to be expended as the Chief Justice in his discretion may approve, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses for subsistence at rates to be fixed by him not to exceed \$10 per day, \$11,500, to remain available until June 30, 1954."

Amendment No. 19: Page 7, line 16, insert "of which \$1,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'International information and educational activities', Department of State Appropriation Act, 1953."

Amendment No. 20: Page 7, line 20, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

"The Attorney General is hereby authorized to transfer from appropriations contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, not to exceed \$270,000 to the appropriation 'Fees and expenses of witnesses, Justice', 1953, and not to exceed \$600,000 to the appropriation 'Support of United States prisoners, Federal prison system', 1953."

Amendment No. 25: Page 10, line 1, insert:

"Claims

"For an additional amount for 'claims', \$300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Transportation of mails', fiscal year 1953."

Amendment No. 30: Page 12, line 22, insert:

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', \$7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses', National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953."

Amendment No. 31: Page 13, line 3, insert:

"Arbitration and emergency boards

"For an additional amount for 'Arbitration and emergency boards', \$10,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses', National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953."

Amendment No. 32: Page 13, line 8, insert:

"NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

"Salaries and expenses

"The amount made available under this head in the National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1953, exclusively for compensation and expenses of referees is decreased from '\$216,000' to '\$199,000.'"

Amendment No. 42: Page 20, line 20, insert:

"CHAPTER X

"Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments

"For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document No. 19, 83d Congress, \$13,230,038, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to those amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 30, 25, 30, 31, 32, 42 and concur therein.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of explaining amendment No. 28. You will recall that about 2 weeks ago, when this legislation was before the House, I offered an amendment to provide for the transfer of certain supervisory funds from the Office of Education to General Services. I note in the conference report the Senate receded from its position. I asked for \$145,000. The Senate had put in the bill which went to conference \$125,000, which cut the item from \$145,000, in the same ratio that they cut the \$24 million back to \$20.5 million.

There is nothing that can be done about it at this time, but I want the RECORD to show that you are going to have difficulty in administering this law, because General Services does not have the money which is now in the hands of the Office of Education, to cover the cost of this supervisory work. I think it should be notice to the Committee on Appropriations that additional funds will have to go into the regular appropriation bill which will become effective July 1 to cover this cost. They positively cannot administer this law without these funds to pay General Services.

May I add, if the gentleman will bear with me, that as the author and sponsor

of this legislation I particularly wrote into the legislation words that would prohibit the Office of Education from setting up an engineering supervisory staff, and directed them to enter into an agreement with some other governmental agency, which they did with General Services. It is a matter of economy, and it is the best way I know to keep the Office of Education from setting up a costly staff of its own, that we make the money available to pay General Services for this supervisory work.

I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity to clarify the RECORD.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the evidence showed that the outfit had spent too much money on administration; that it is supposed to have too many personnel employees, too many bookkeepers and accountants, and that sort of thing. That is the basis for the attitude of the committee.

I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: Page 9, line 21, insert:

"Postal operations

"For an additional amount for 'Postal operations', \$28,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Transportation of mails', fiscal year 1953."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 24, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$28,000,000" in said amendment, insert "\$24,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: Page 11, line 18, insert
": *Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed on Federal property situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to payments under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to such children in the same manner as if such Federal property were situated in the same State as such agency."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert
": *Provided*, That for the fiscal year begin-

ning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed by the Department of Defense on Federal property, other than in the District of Columbia, situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to payments under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to such children in the same manner as if such Federal property were situated in the same State as such agency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 13, line 14, insert:

"CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

"Loan authorizations

"The basic amount authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury for the rural electrification program is decreased from '\$50,000,000' to '\$35,000,000,' and the basic amount authorized by said act to be borrowed for the rural telephone program is increased from '\$25,000,000' to '\$40,000,000.'"

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$40,000,000" named in said amendment, insert "\$35,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire time?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do, if the gentleman please.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to present the other side in this matter. We are opposed to the gentleman's motion, which would reduce the REA authorization for loans by \$15 million and would increase the loan authorization for rural telephones. In taking this action I am speaking for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who is chairman of this subcommittee. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and I are both for the increase in loan authorization for rural telephone loans but we believe such increase should not be at the expense of reducing loan authorizations for electric-power loans. If you will help us defeat the motion of the gentleman from New York, I will offer a motion increasing the authorization for telephone loans, which is badly needed but which will not reduce REA authorizations.

Our Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I was chairman last year and of which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] heads this year, in its report last year committed itself to approving additional loan authorizations for the telephone program if the number of loan requests required it.

In our report we stated:

While there were some indications from witnesses appearing before the committee that a total of \$50 million would be required for the telephone program next year, the committee has decided to recommend the amount provided in the budget together with a contingency fund of \$10 million. The record of Congress on these programs over the years is such that the committee feels that additional funds will be made available if needed.

With a valuable program such as this just getting under way, I believe it would be highly inadvisable to practically shut it down at this point because of the lack of loan funds. We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that these are loan funds and not direct appropriations. These funds are borrowed from the Treasury for making loans to rural cooperatives and will, as experience has shown us, be practically fully repaid plus interest, there is no ultimate cost to the taxpayers and unless loan applications meet the requirements of the law, the money will not be withdrawn from the Treasury at all. In this connection, I wish to again call to your attention the splendid repayment record of Rural Electrification, which is unusually good. The latest data available to our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture shows that delinquency in repayments is running less than two-tenths of 1 percent. Based on this splendid record, Mr. Speaker, there can be little doubt as to the eventual repayment of practically all of the loan funds made available by Congress for the REA and the REA telephone program.

In January when the initial request for an additional \$15 million in loan authorization for this fiscal year was allocated, we had in mind then that only about 33 of the most urgent pending cases of the 611 applications on hand prior to June 30 could be taken care of. Please also keep in mind that most of these urgent cases are those where loans must be approved before June 30 to enable borrowers to exercise options on properties needed and to meet other deadlines imposed on them by State regulatory bodies. Any unnecessary delay now will create many difficulties and in some cases direct financial loss for these applicants. So much for the need on increase in loan authorizations for the rural telephone program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the REA and the rural telephone programs are two entirely different operations. There is no reason, in my opinion, to penalize the REA by reducing its loan authorizations \$15 million to give the rural telephone program an increase in loan authorization of \$10 million. If requests for telephone loans are sound they should be authorized. If electricity loan requests are sound they should be made. Certainly to obtain a loan for one should not be made contingent upon turning down a sound application of the other. May I call the attention of the House to the fact that this particular item was not referred to our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, as would have been the normal course. This language adding to one program at the expense of

the other was put in the bill by the Senate and consequently our subcommittee which would ordinarily be concerned with these items is now giving them the first consideration possible. I respectfully urge the House to leave the decision as to how much loan funds REA should have to our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture. We should not reduce retroactively without a proper hearing. If it proves that the program does not need the present existing loan funds, we will take that into account when considering the authorization for this coming year. Today—in this particular bill—is no place to make that decision. I do not recall any similar instance in the past years where in order to give one program needed funds, we took a larger amount or more from another. It is not good legislative procedure.

I want to say that the REA program is a loan program that pays 2 percent interest on all loans. The committee, contrary to a statement made by the budget officer, which I am sure the gentleman from New York will present to you, the subcommittee last year and the Congress stated and have repeatedly stated that if further loan authorization were needed to carry out the law for the REA program they would be provided; and I want to be absolutely certain that that will be done.

Bear in mind the fact that the repayment rate is sufficiently good that less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the borrowers from REA are as much as 30 days in arrears on repayments.

Last year we made provision for the REA program, but in December of this year they were told to cancel out and rescind \$30 million. Now it is said that with that \$30 million in loans cancelled you can take this \$15 million away from them. I do not know that the REA should have withdrawn that \$30 million of loans which they had some time before approved, do you? Our committee has had no opportunity to study such action.

It could be the Congress after our committee hearings would wish to direct the Department to restore their approval to such loans. It may not, but until we have hearings on this matter, how can we justify reducing the authorization provided last year.

Who told the REA to rescind these loans? I do not know, do you? I, too, believe in a rural telephone program where the requirements of the law are met, but I cannot see how you can say to anybody in this country that we will help you by lending you money for a telephone if you will do without lights or if somebody else will do without lights. The user and his co-op borrower pay for either with interest.

The budget officer has sent down a letter saying that in view of rescinding of \$30 million of loans in December 1952, they can take \$15 million from the \$30 million, but in so doing they limit to that extent the funds that would be available under the actions of our subcommittee of last year which was approved by the Congress. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL

ANDERSEN] has so ably argued this is the first time in my experience, or that I remember of, that such an occurrence as this has taken place. I concur with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], chairman of the subcommittee, that it is an unsound practice. I do not believe it is sound to take such action. The late REA Director in one of his last official utterances, said the increase in telephone-loan authorizations should not be by reducing the authorizations for electricity loans. Whether he was correct in that statement our committee has had no chance to check. I do not know whether that influenced Mr. Roberts or not, but I do know that the REA will not borrow a dime from the Treasury until the loan is approved. The loan under the law sets up requirements to be met before a loan is made. If the authorization is larger than the total number of loan applications which are determined to be sound, the money will not be taken from the Treasury. In fact, when a loan is granted, the money is not withdrawn from the Treasury except as expended for labor and materials and other purposes for which the loans were granted.

The law states the basis upon which the loan shall be made available and if applicants qualify and show it will be repaid, and the people to be served cannot otherwise be served, every Member of this Congress, with a few exceptions, would like to see those loans made for they have proven to be sound. Electricity on the farms, on loans, repaid with interest is one of the best ways to balance the budget I know of. Today 16 percent of the farms of this country that do not have electricity and many of the 84 percent which do have service have an inadequate supply. There has been a 10 percent increase in the use of electricity by those who are already on the lines. But there is hardly a system in the United States that does not need some replacement of lines so that they will bring better service to the country. Let me tell you also that 64 percent of all the power that all of the REA's use is bought from the private power companies. One of the best customers of the private power company is the REA.

I say to you, do not by this action say that the Congress will lend to rural people money for a telephone if somebody will do without lights. Do not be misled by the statement that will undoubtedly be made that the budget officer says you can do this and take it out of the \$30 million. We may, and I do not know, but we may want to make them go ahead with a part of that \$30 million they took back after approval. Perhaps we will not but let us know the facts. If there is going to be any restriction in the REA development of this country, because of action by the Budget Bureau or the Executive Department, let the responsibility be fixed. Do not let it be because of congressional action on last year's authorization. Loan applications should not be approved unless they are sound, but if they are sound, they should, period.

I want to repeat again, the chairman of the subcommittee, Hon. H. CARL

ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, says this is the first time he has seen this course followed. He is strongly opposed to the Taber motion and has approved the motion I shall offer. I assure you when the matter comes before our subcommittee we will give proper attention to it. If the pending motion is defeated I will offer the amendment which I have discussed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, your conferees gave every consideration to the statements of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. I talked to him for a half hour on this matter. We gave every consideration to the actual situation of the REA funds and we found certain facts to exist. I have here a letter from Ralph Roberts, budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, dated March 18, 1953, which reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
March 18, 1953.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TABER: This will confirm information given you during our telephone conversation this afternoon regarding the current status of loan funds available in the Rural Electrification Administration.

Funds available in the current fiscal year for electrification loans, including balances carried forward as well as the current authorization carried in the 1953 Agricultural Appropriation Act, total \$197,298,000. Inasmuch as a loan program of \$165 million was planned and approved by the Congress for the fiscal year 1953, there will be an unused balance of \$32,298,000 in loan funds as of June 30, 1953. If the Congress approves language inserted by the Senate in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1953, \$15 million of these funds will be transferred for additional telephone loans to be made between now and June 30. Accordingly, the transfer will not have the effect of reducing the electrification loan program in fiscal year 1953.

Sincerely yours,
RALPH ROBERTS,
Budget Officer.

On top of that I wish to call attention to the fact that when the budget went to the Senate the Budget Director called attention to the fact that funds for electrification loans are in an excessive amount needed for carrying out the current year's planned program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wondered if the gentleman is aware—I am sure he is—that the REA loan authorization is based on a formula, and while there might be funds available within the total, due to the formula, they may be completely exhausted in a particular State, and the fact that the total amount authorized is not committed would not change that. I wonder further if the gentleman is aware that the subcommittee and the Congress has given assurance each year that if the requirements of the law were met by applicants for loans, and additional funds were needed, they would be provided. The program that the budget officer lists is not correct when he mentions the amount that was set up for it,

because we directed further, and a statement in our report on the telephone program will show, that if the requirements of the law were met, that those additional funds would be provided.

Mr. TABER. We are aware of just what the subcommittee has done. We know that the adoption of this motion will not in any way impair the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 69, noes 54.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 191, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—165

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Allen, Calif. | Fogarty | Mumma |
| Allen, Ill. | Ford | Neal |
| Angell | Frelinghuysen | Nelson |
| Arends | Friedel | Nicholson |
| Auchincloss | Fulton | Norblad |
| Ayres | Gavin | Oakman |
| Bates | Golden | Osmers |
| Belcher | Goodwin | Ostertag |
| Bender | Graham | Patterson |
| Bentley | Gubser | Pelly |
| Betts | Hale | Phillips |
| Bishop | Halleck | Prouty |
| Bolton, | Hand | Radwan |
| Frances P. | Hébert | Ray |
| Bolton, | Heslton | Reed, Ill. |
| Oliver P. | Hess | Reed, N. Y. |
| Bonin | Hiestand | Riehlman |
| Bosch | Hillelson | Robson, Ky. |
| Bow | Hinshaw | Rogers, Mass. |
| Bramblett | Hoffman, Ill. | Rooney |
| Brown, Ohio | Hoffman, Mich. | St. George |
| Brownson | Holt | Saylor |
| Broyhill | Hosmer | Schenck |
| Budge | Hruska | Scott |
| Busbey | Jackson | Secrest |
| Bush | James | Seely-Brown |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Jenkins | Shafer |
| Canfield | Jensen | Short |
| Carrigg | Jonas, Ill. | Small |
| Cederberg | Jonas, N. C. | Smith, Wis. |
| Chenoweth | Kearney | Springer |
| Chiperfield | Kearns | Staufner |
| Church | Keating | Stringfellow |
| Clevenger | Kersten, Wis. | Taber |
| Cole, N. Y. | Kilburn | Taylor |
| Coon | King, Pa. | Thomas |
| Corbett | Knox | Thompson, Mich. |
| Cotton | Krueger | Utt |
| Coudert | Laird | Van Pelt |
| Cretella | LeCompte | Van Zandt |
| Crumpacker | Lyle | Velde |
| Curtis, Mass. | McConnell | Vorys |
| Curtis, Mo. | McCulloch | Vursell |
| Curtis, Nebr. | McDonough | Wainwright |
| Dague | McGregor | Wampler |
| Davis, Wis. | McVey | Warburton |
| Dawson, Utah | Mack, Wash. | Weichel |
| Derounian | Mailliard | Wharton |
| Devereux | Mason | Widnall |
| Dondero | Meador | Wigglesworth |
| Dorn, N. Y. | Merrill | Wilson, Calif. |
| Ellsworth | Morrow | Wolverton |
| Engle | Miller, Md. | Yates |
| Fallon | Miller, N. Y. | Young |
| Fenton | Morano | Younger |
| Fino | | |

NAYS—191

| | | |
|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| Abbitt | Andrews | Bennett, Mich. |
| Abernethy | Aspinall | Bentsen |
| Addonizio | Bailey | Berry |
| Albert | Baker | Blatnik |
| Alexander | Battle | Boggs |
| Andersen, | Beamer | Boland |
| August H. | Bennett, Fla. | Bonner |

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Bray | Hoeven | Powell |
| Brooks, La. | Hollfield | Preston |
| Brooks, Tex. | Holmes | Priest |
| Brown, Ga. | Holtzman | Rains |
| Buchanan | Hope | Rayburn |
| Burdick | Howell | Reams |
| Byrd | Ikard | Rees, Kans. |
| Camp | Javits | Regan |
| Carlyle | Jones, Ala. | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Carnahan | Jones, N. C. | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Cole, Mo. | Judd | Richards |
| Colmer | Karsten, Mo. | Riley |
| Cooley | Kee | Roberts |
| Cooper | King, Calif. | Robeson, Va. |
| Cunningham | Kirwan | Rodino |
| Davis, Ga. | Klein | Rogers, Colo. |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kluczynski | Rogers, Fla. |
| Deane | Landrun | Rogers, Tex. |
| Delaney | Lane | Roosevelt |
| Dempsey | Lanham | Scrivner |
| D'Ewart | Lantaff | Selden |
| Dies | Lesinski | Sheppard |
| Dollinger | Lovre | Shuford |
| Dolliver | Lucas | Sieminski |
| Donohue | McCarthy | Sikes |
| Dowdy | McMillan | Simpson, Ill. |
| Eberhart | Machrowicz | Smith, Kans. |
| Edmondson | Mack, Ill. | Smith, Miss. |
| Elliott | Madden | Smith, Va. |
| Evins | Magnuson | Spence |
| Fernandez | Mahon | Staggers |
| Fine | Metcalf | Steed |
| Fisher | Miller, Calif. | Sullivan |
| Forand | Miller, Kans. | Sutton |
| Forrester | Miller, Nebr. | Talle |
| Fountain | Mills | Teague |
| Frazier | Mollohan | Thompson, La. |
| Gary | Morgan | Thornberry |
| Gathings | Morrison | Tollefson |
| Gentry | Moss | Trimble |
| George | Multer | Vinson |
| Gordon | Murray | Walter |
| Granahan | O'Brien, Ill. | Watts |
| Grant | O'Brien, Mich. | Wheeler |
| Green | O'Hara, Ill. | Whitten |
| Gregory | O'Hara, Minn. | Wickersham |
| Gross | O'Konski | Wier |
| Hagen, Minn. | O'Neill | Williams, Miss. |
| Haley | Passman | Williams, N. Y. |
| Harden | Patman | Willis |
| Harris | Patten | Wilson, Ind. |
| Harrison, Nebr. | Perkins | Wilson, Tex. |
| Harrison, Va. | Pfost | Winstead |
| Harrison, Wyo. | Philbin | Withers |
| Harvey | Pilcher | Withrow |
| Hays, Ark. | Poage | Yorty |
| Hill | Polk | Zablocki |

NOT VOTING—75

| | | |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adair | Doyle | McCormack |
| Andersen, | Durham | McIntire |
| H. Carl | Feighan | Marshall |
| Barden | Gamble | Martin, Iowa |
| Barrett | Garmatz | Matthews |
| Becker | Gwinn | Moulder |
| Bolling | Hagen, Calif. | Norrell |
| Boykin | Hardy | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Buckley | Hart | Pillion |
| Burleson | Hays, Ohio | Poff |
| Byrne, Pa. | Heller | Poulson |
| Campbell | Herlong | Price |
| Cannon | Hillings | Rabaut |
| Case | Horan | Reece, Tenn. |
| Celler | Hull | Rivers |
| Chatham | Hunter | Sadlak |
| Chelf | Hyde | Scherer |
| Chudoff | Jarman | Scudder |
| Clardy | Johnson | Sheehan |
| Condon | Jones, Mo. | Shelley |
| Crosser | Kelley, Pa. | Simpson, Pa. |
| Dawson, Ill. | Kelly, N. Y. | Thompson, Tex. |
| Dingell | Keogh | Westland |
| Dodd | Kilday | Wolcott |
| Donovan | Latham | |
| Dorn, S. C. | Long | |

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Scherer for, with Mr. Dodd against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Price against.

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Case for, with Mr. Campbell against.

Mr. Becker for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Poulson for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Mr. Sadlak for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Horan with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Heller.

Mr. Westland with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Wolcott with Mrs. Kelly of New York.

Mr. Johnson with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Adair with Mr. Chudoff.

Mr. Pillion with Mr. Matthews.

Mr. Scudder with Mr. Rabaut.

Mr. Hyde with Mr. Bolling.

Mr. Hunter with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Clardy with Mr. Doyle.

Mr. H. Carl Andersen with Mr. Feighan.

Messrs. D'EWARD and HARRISON of Wyoming changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement on amendment No. 33 and concur with an amendment to read as follows:

"The basic amount authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury for the rural telephone program, is increased from \$25 million to \$35 million."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I might say my motion provides an increase of \$10 million in loan authorization for the telephone program. It accepts the figures of the gentleman from New York as the difference being that it is not deducted from the REA authorization passed last year as Mr. TABER's motion would have done.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the budget and the budget officer of the Department have said that the money for this purpose could be taken away from the REA without any harm. If we are ever going to save a dollar and redeem the pledges that we made to the people of the United States, it is time for us to do so now. If there was any reason for it, I would not fuss so much about this, but if we are going to start irresponsibly, this is the way to do it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, this is not an expenditure of funds but an authorization. If the applicants do not meet requirements the loans will not be made nor the money spent. If the applications qualify, I think the loans should be made for they are sound.

I read the newspapers and the platforms last year and I do not recall ever reading anywhere that anybody, of either party, ran on the basis that they would reduce the amount of loan authorizations for the REA electrification program and make such reduction retroactive. I take the stand I took a moment ago that I am for rural-telephone loans where the requirements of the law are met, but I do not believe that you folks believe we should say you can have a

loan for a telephone for which you pay if you or somebody will do without lights. The motion of the gentleman was to reduce firm figures in authorizations that were passed last year, and I helped to sponsor those, as did the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] for whom I spoke. The motion I now have is to give increased authorization for loans for the telephone program by \$10 million. That is all that is before you. Those loans, too, will be repaid with interest, and there is not a finer record in the United States than the repayment rate for electricity and for rural telephones. You have just now voted with me against taking this authorization away from the authorization for rural electricity. You voted down Mr. TABER's motion and I think in the future many of you are going to be glad you did. Now the only thing is, Are you going to approve the increased authorization for rural telephones? There is a real need for the increased ceiling. Here again the money will not be loaned unless the requirements of the law are met as to need and as to soundness. Remember there are over 600 loan applications now pending.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Mississippi is talking here about something that the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations has not gone into in detail this year but will within the next few weeks.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. The action of our committee will be for the period July 1, 1953, to July 1, 1954.

Mr. LAIRD. The Budget Director of the Department of Agriculture has assured the Members of Congress that there will be \$32,298,000 in unused loan funds available as of June 30, 1953. Accordingly, the transfer will not have the effect of reducing the electrification-loan program in fiscal year 1953. It seems strange after many of us have made certain pledges to the people of this Nation that we were going to come to the Congress this year and work for the reduction of spending authorizations, that, on one of the first votes where we can actually reduce authorizations which are not necessary for an agency this year, we are willing to vote \$10 million of new money that is not needed at this time. The amendment, of our distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, transferring \$10 million of unspent loan funds from electricity loans to telephone loans for the remaining part of fiscal year 1953 should have carried.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know of any pledges you made to reduce the loan authorization for the Rural Electrification Administration electric program or the telephone program which was passed last year. The law specifies that not a dollar shall be loaned until certain requirements of the law are met; that is, they must be economically sound so the loans will be repaid. The record shows they are being repaid, less than two-tenths of 1 percent of all loans being as much as 30 days in arrears. When the American

people asking for such meet the requirements of that law, all the Members of Congress on both sides have permitted them to lift the ceiling of the loan authorizations each and every time. Each time it has led to further development of our country on a sound basis. The loans have been sound. You are not saving money by this shortsighted action. I do say that in this instance it is only loan authorization. If the loans are not made, the money will not come out of the Treasury, even. The loans will not be made unless they are 100 percent sound and meet all the requirements of the law. There is not a dollar wasted, and the loans will not be made unless the need exists. If the need exists, if the loan will be repaid with interest I do not think anyone would want the lights to be turned off or withheld over this country when the farmers pay for them with interest. The same goes for the telephone program. I repeat, why say, "We will help you to finance your needs on the telephones, if somebody will do without lights?" It is not sound.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman is talking about something that has no place in this discussion. We have never pledged to anybody appropriations in addition to those actually needed, and that is what you are doing here. You are authorizing unneeded balances in the electrification program. All this amendment did was transfer some of these unused authorizations to the telephone program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does anyone know they will not be needed or used for the rest of the year? If the need exists, and I understand nearly every REA borrower needs to enlarge his lines to carry the loads now needed by the farmer. I have had many requests to urge the REA to expedite loans for this reason. If such need is not met by the REA I wish to be sure it was not because of action of the Congress.

Mr. LAIRD. It is an authorization for spending in addition to the requests that have been made upon the electrification program. All appropriations are merely authorizations and remain in the Treasury until actually expended. We now have too many unused authorizations outstanding in our various Federal departments.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, here your administration will determine what loans are made. They cannot be made unless they meet the requirements of the law, and the law provides the loans must be for service to farmers who do not otherwise have service. It further provides that the loan must be repaid with interest. If those conditions exist, I think the people ought to have the loans. The Congress said so last year. I did not see that anybody last fall on either side committed himself to go back and reduce the Rural Electrification Administration authorization passed last year to meet this year's need for telephone loans. Our subcommittee did agree last year to go along with an increase in the authorization for telephone loans. Such need has been proven, and I trust my motion will be approved.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 80, noes 97.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were yeas 171, nays 174, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—171

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abbott | Harden | Patten |
| Abernethy | Harris | Perkins |
| Addonizio | Harrison, Nebr. | Pfost |
| Albert | Harrison, Va. | Philbin |
| Alexander | Harrison, Wyo. | Pilcher |
| Andrews | Harvey | Poage |
| Aspinall | Hays, Ark. | Polk |
| Bailey | Hébert | Powell |
| Battle | Hill | Preston |
| Bennett, Mich. | Hoeven | Priest |
| Bentsen | Holifield | Rains |
| Berry | Holmes | Reams |
| Blatnik | Holtzman | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Boggs | Hope | Richards |
| Boland | Ikard | Riley |
| Bonner | Javits | Roberts |
| Brooks, La. | Jonas, N. C. | Robeson, Va. |
| Brooks, Tex. | Jones, Ala. | Rogers, Colo. |
| Brown, Ga. | Jones, N. C. | Rogers, Fla. |
| Buchanan | Judd | Rogers, Tex. |
| Burdick | Kee | Roosevelt |
| Byrd | King, Calif. | Secret |
| Camp | Kirwan | Selden |
| Carnahan | Klein | Sheppard |
| Cole, Mo. | Kluczynski | Shuford |
| Colmer | Landrum | Sieminski |
| Cooley | Lane | Sikes |
| Cooper | Lanham | Simpson, Ill. |
| Cunningham | Lesinski | Smith, Kans. |
| Davis, Tenn. | Long | Smith, Miss. |
| Dawson, Ill. | Lovre | Smith, Va. |
| Deane | Lucas | Spence |
| Dempsey | Lyle | Staggers |
| D'Ewart | McCarthy | Steed |
| Dies | McMillan | Sullivan |
| Dollinger | Machrowicz | Sutton |
| Dolliver | Magnuson | Talle |
| Donohue | Mahon | Teague |
| Dowdy | Metcalf | Thompson, La. |
| Eberharter | Miller, Calif. | Thornberry |
| Elliott | Miller, Kans. | Tollefson |
| Evins | Miller, Nebr. | Trimble |
| Fisher | Mills | Vinson |
| Forand | Mollohan | Walter |
| Forrester | Morgan | Wampler |
| Fountain | Morrison | Watts |
| Frazier | Moss | Wheeler |
| Friedel | Moulder | Whitten |
| Gary | Multer | Wickersham |
| Gathings | Murray | Williams, Miss. |
| Gentry | Norrell | Willis |
| Golden | O'Brien, Mich. | Wilson, Tex. |
| Grant | O'Hara, Minn. | Winstead |
| Gregory | O'Konski | Withers |
| Gross | O'Neill | Withrow |
| Hagen, Minn. | Passman | Yorty |
| Haley | Patman | Zablocki |

NAYS—174

| | | |
|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| Allen, Calif. | Bentley | Budge |
| Allen, Ill. | Betts | Busbey |
| Andresen, | Bishop | Bush |
| August H. | Bolton, | Byrnes, Wis. |
| Angell | Frances P. | Canfield |
| Arends | Bolton, | Carrigg |
| Auchincloss | Oliver P. | Cederberg |
| Ayres | Bonin | Chenoweth |
| Baker | Bosch | Chilperfield |
| Bates | Bow | Church |
| Beamer | Bramblett | Clevenger |
| Belcher | Brown, Ohio | Cole, N. Y. |
| Bender | Brownson | Coon |
| Bennett, Fla. | Broyhill | Corbett |

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Cotton | James | Reed, Ill. |
| Coudert | Jenkins | Reed, N. Y. |
| Cretella | Jensen | Rees, Kans. |
| Crumpacker | Johnson | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Curtis, Mass. | Jonas, Ill. | Robison, Ky. |
| Curtis, Mo. | Kean | Rogers, Mass. |
| Curtis, Nebr. | Kearney | Rooney |
| Dague | Kearns | St. George |
| Davis, Wis. | Keating | Saylor |
| Dawson, Utah | Kersten, Wis. | Schenck |
| Derounian | Kilburn | Scott |
| Devereux | King, Pa. | Scrivner |
| Dondero | Knox | Seely-Brown |
| Dorn, N. Y. | Krueger | Shafer |
| Ellsworth | Laird | Short |
| Engle | Lantaff | Simpson, Pa. |
| Fallon | LeCompte | Small |
| Fenton | McConnell | Smith, Wis. |
| Fernandez | McCulloch | Springer |
| Fino | McDonough | Stauffer |
| Fogarty | McGregor | Stringfellow |
| Ford | McVey | Taber |
| Frelinghuysen | Mack, Wash. | Taylor |
| Fulton | Madden | Thomas |
| Gamble | Mailliard | Thompson, Mich. |
| Gavin | Mason | Utt |
| George | Merrill | Van Pelt |
| Goodwin | Morrow | Van Zandt |
| Gordon | Miller, Md. | Velde |
| Graham | Miller, N. Y. | Vors |
| Gubser | Morano | Vursell |
| Gwinn | Mumma | Wainwright |
| Hale | Neal | Warburton |
| Halleck | Nelson | Weichel |
| Hand | Nicholson | Wharton |
| Heseltun | Norblad | Widnall |
| Hess | O'Brien, Ill. | Wigglesworth |
| Hiestand | O'Hara, Ill. | Williams, N. Y. |
| Hillelson | OSmers | Wilson, Calif. |
| Hinshaw | Ostertag | Wilson, Ind. |
| Hoffman, Ill. | Patterson | Wolverton |
| Hoffman, Mich. | Pelly | Young |
| Holt | Phillips | Younger |
| Hosmer | Prouty | |
| Hruska | Radwan | |
| Jackson | Ray | |

NOT VOTING—86

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| Adair | Doyle | McIntire |
| Andersen, | Durham | Mack, Ill. |
| H. Carl | Edmondson | Marshall |
| Barden | Felghan | Martin, Iowa |
| Barrett | Fine | Matthews |
| Becker | Garmatz | Meador |
| Bolling | Granahan | Oakman |
| Boykin | Green | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Bray | Hagen, Calif. | Pillion |
| Buckley | Hardy | Poff |
| Burleson | Hart | Poulson |
| Byrne, Pa. | Hays, Ohio | Price |
| Campbell | Heller | Rabaut |
| Cannon | Herlong | Rayburn |
| Carlyle | Hillings | Reece, Tenn. |
| Case | Horan | Regan |
| Celler | Howell | Riehlman |
| Chatham | Hull | Rivers |
| Chelf | Hunter | Rodino |
| Chudoff | Hyde | Sadlak |
| Clardy | Jarman | Scherer |
| Condon | Jones, Mo. | Scudder |
| Crosser | Karsten, Mo. | Sheehan |
| Davis, Ga. | Kelley, Pa. | Shelley |
| Delaney | Kelly, N. Y. | Thompson, Tex. |
| Dingell | Keogh | Westland |
| Dodd | Kilday | Wier |
| Donovan | Latham | Wolcott |
| Dorn, S. C. | McCormack | Yates |

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Poulson against.

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Case against.

Mr. Dodd for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Campbell for, with Mr. Scherer against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. Thompson of Texas for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Becker against.

Mr. Mack of Illinois for, with Mr. Sadlak against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Scudder against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Riehlman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Adair with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Warburton with Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Westland with Mr. Heller.
Mr. Wolcott with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Fine.
Mr. Oakman with Mrs. Kelly of New York.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Poff with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Clardy with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Bray with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Hyde with Mr. Rabaut.
Mr. Pillion with Mr. Crosser.
Mr. H. Carl Andersen with Mr. Granahan.
Mr. Meador with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Chudoff.
Mr. Hunter with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. OSMERS, and Mr. MERROW changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RICHARDS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks previously made in connection with the conference report.)

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks previously made in connection with the conference report and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks previously made in connection with the conference report.)

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call 17, I am reported as not voting. I was present and voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation which was read by the Clerk:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1953.

HON. JOSEPH MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

Sincerely yours,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, sections 1083 and 1084, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Visitors to

the United States Naval Academy the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPARD] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

AMENDING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement, and then to include in my announcement an explanation of the bills which I intend to talk about.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and I have introduced identical bills to amend the Unemployment Compensation Act. We want to make the act more sound and more stable than it is, and we also want to see to it that all the money collected for unemployment compensation shall go for unemployment compensation and not for other purposes. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] had a bill in a year ago. It was the same kind of bill. We had extensive hearings, and I have been assured that the new chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] will announce that we will have open hearings on these bills immediately after the Easter recess. I am making this announcement so all those who are interested in this proposition may read the explanations that I shall put in the RECORD so that they will know what it is all about.

AN EXPLANATION OF H. R. 3530 AND H. R. 3531,
UNEMPLOYMENT-COMPENSATION BILLS

The bills, H. R. 3530 and H. R. 3531, introduced by Mr. MILLS and myself, have but one purpose—to improve and strengthen the nationwide Federal-State employment-security system. This system, which makes so important a contribution to the economic security of the Nation's workers and provides a publicly supported placement service for workers and employers, thereby promoting stability in the whole economy, owes its existence to the Wagner-Peyser and Social Security Acts, passed by the Congress in 1933 and 1935 respectively. This is so because these acts stimulated the States to pass legislation which placed employment security programs in actual operation.

Over the years the States have acted, within their sphere of authority, to improve and strengthen their employment security programs. The States cannot, however, act with respect to those matters which are within the sphere of the authority of the Congress. These bills would effect improvements which only the Congress can make.

These bills would improve the employment security system in three major respects:

First. They would insure that all unemployment payroll taxes are used only for employment security purposes by making it impossible for the Federal Government to divert any part of them to finance its general expenses.

Second. They would promote more effective administration by placing administrative financing on a more stable basis.

Third. They would promote sounder benefit financing by making permanent the expired George loan fund provision for loans to States whose reserves become low and by providing machinery which would insure that any such loans would be repaid.

The Federal Unemployment Tax Act imposes a tax of 3 percent on the payrolls of employers subject to it. Employers actually pay only 10 percent of this tax to the Federal Government; the remainder is offset by virtue of payments to States of taxes imposed by State unemployment compensation laws.

The revenue thus collected by the States must be placed in a benefit trust fund, which cannot be touched except for the payment of benefits. For administrative funds the States are entirely reliant on Federal grants.

The payments which are made to the Federal Government—10 percent of 3.0 percent, or at a rate of 0.3 percent of payrolls—now go into the general funds of the Treasury. During the years since the Federal Unemployment Tax Act became effective in 1936, collections under it have exceeded congressional appropriations for grants to States for the administration of their employment security programs by about \$1 billion. This excess has constituted a profit for the Federal Government at the expense of the employment security system, for these taxes are paid by employers as unemployment payroll taxes, under a law labeled as the "Federal Unemployment Tax Act."

Employers who pay these taxes want them used solely for employment security purposes and by their very nature they should be so used. This bill, therefore, would specifically earmark them and place them in a special account in the United States Treasury, and they could be withdrawn from this account and used only for employment security purposes. Specifically, these earmarked revenues would first of all be used as the source from which the Congress would make appropriations.

First. For grants to States to pay the costs of administering their employment security programs.

Second. To pay the costs of administering Federal employment security functions performed by the United States Department of Labor.

Third. To pay the costs incurred by the Post Office in handling the official mail of State employment security agencies.

In each of these cases the Congress would control the amount of the withdrawals from the earmarked fund through appropriations. The appropriations process would be exactly the same as now, except that the source of the funds would be the earmarked unemployment tax revenues rather than the general funds of the Treasury. Moreover, the bill would preserve the present Federal controls that insure minimum standards in all the States.

These bills further provide that the yearly excess of Federal unemployment tax collections over the appropriations specified above would be used in two ways:

First. Twenty percent of it would be placed in a special revolving reserve fund in the United States Treasury, as a source from which loans could be made to State employment security agencies whose unemployment reserves become low. Twenty percent of the annual excess would go into the special revolving reserve fund until a total of \$100 million had been accumulated.

Second. The remainder of the excess would be distributed among the States pro rata according to the size of their taxable payrolls for their use either (a) to build up their benefit reserve funds or (b) to pay costs of administration, as the individual States found necessary. The States would thus be freed from total reliance on the Federal Government for administrative funds, and would be given needed flexibility to meet fluctuating economic conditions and leeway to improve operations.

These bills would, further, make permanent the George loan fund, initially created in 1944 by the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, for the purpose of making loans to State employment security agencies whose unemployment reserve funds become low. As outlined above, the bills would place 20 percent of the annual excess of Federal unemployment tax collections in the fund, until a total of \$100 million had been accumulated, thus providing revenues from which to make loans. They would also establish machinery to enforce repayment of any such loan, by reducing the tax offset allowed employers in any State which failed to repay within a specified time.

The Congress, by creating the George loan fund, recognized the national interest in assuring that State unemployment reserves remain solvent. In the same way it also established as national policy that the appropriate method of expressing this national interest was by making loans to needy States rather than by outright gifts. These bills include these two basic principles.

It is not expected that any State will need a loan within the foreseeable future. Nevertheless, adequate provision for the future requires recognition that some State may need one at some time. Action cannot wait until the actual need arises, just as no community can afford to wait until a fire occurs to establish a fire department. The George loan fund expired on December 31, 1951. It should be made permanent now and improved as these bills would provide.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to ask the distinguished majority leader if he can give us the legislative program for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, Monday is the day regularly assigned for the consideration of bills having to do with the District of Columbia. I understand there are several bills that have been reported out and which are waiting action on next Monday, some of which may be controversial. However, we shall undertake to dispose of them on Monday. There are numerous bills on which we anticipate rules will be granted so that they may be taken up and considered next week. A couple of them involve existing statutes which have an expiration date of March 21. Probably those rules will be granted on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Is H. R. 1 among those bills?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not have the floor. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. REED of New York. He probably could not answer that question.

Mr. PRIEST. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. H. R. 1 is not one of them at this moment.

Mr. REED of New York. I wanted that for the record.

ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY NEXT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next when the House adjourns, it adjourn to meet on the following Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. If rules are granted—and I have no reason to think they will not be—we would expect to take up on Wednesday and Thursday H. R. 3853, which has to do with the extension of certain war powers. We will also consider House Joint Resolution 226, which deals with the matter of extension of war powers. Both are measures which, as I indicated before, deal with existing statutes which have an expiration date.

Mr. PRIEST. Taking up these matters will depend on rules being granted in each case?

Mr. HALLECK. That is correct.

There is also pending, reported by the Armed Services Committee, House Resolution 3780, which deals with the extension of the Missing Persons Act. If a rule is granted, we expect to call that up and dispose of it.

There is also pending before the Committee on Armed Services the bill S. 1110,

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued Mar. 24, 1953
For actions of Mar. 23, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 50

CONTENTS

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|------|----------------------------|------|
| Adjournment..... | 6,9 | Forestry..... | 15 | Reclamation..... | 5,12 |
| Appropriations..... | 1 | Hawaii statehood..... | 22 | Reorganization..... | 2 |
| Crop insurance..... | 19 | Livestock industry..... | 3,20 | St. Lawrence waterway..... | 4 |
| Daylight-saving time..... | 11 | Loans, farm..... | 17 | Telephones, rural..... | 1 |
| Electrification, rural..... | 1,4 | Missouri Basin..... | 4 | Textiles..... | 7 |
| Extension Service..... | 24 | Personnel..... | 14 | Trade, foreign..... | 21 |
| Farm program..... | 16,26 | Pricing..... | 13 | Treaties..... | 25 |
| Flammable fabrics..... | 18 | Purchasing..... | 23 | War-risk insurance..... | 10 |
| Flood control..... | 8 | | | | |

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate took final congressional action on 2nd supplemental appropriation bill. Sens. Maybank and Capehart and Rep. Brown, Ga., introduced bills to authorize war-risk insurance for exports of cotton, etc. Rep. Metcalf introduced bill to expand crop-insurance program. Rep. Horan introduced emergency farm loan bill. Senate committee reported measure for FSA reorganization.

SENATE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 3053. In view of the House action reported in Digest 48, the Senate receded from its amendment to transfer lending authority from the rural-electrification program to the rural-telephone program. (pp. 2291-3.) For items of interest to this Department, see Digest 43. This bill will now be sent to the President.
2. REORGANIZATION. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 223, providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1, to create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall become effective 10 days after enactment of this joint resolution (S. Rept. 128)(p. 2263). Sen. Chavez spoke in favor of the Plan (pp. 2290-1).
3. LIVESTOCK. Sen. Schoeppel inserted a series of resolutions of the Kansas Livestock Assn. (pp. 2261-2).
4. MISSOURI BASIN; RURAL ELECTRIFICATION; ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Sen. Langer inserted a N. Dak. Legislature memorial favoring development of the Missouri River Basin, extension of REA benefits, and construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway (p. 2261).
5. RECLAMATION. Received a Colo. Legislature memorial favoring the Colorado River project (pp. 2259-60).
6. ADJOURNED until Wed., Mar. 25 (p. 2295).

HOUSE

7. TEXTILES. Rep. Lane criticized Defense Department delays in purchasing textiles in New England (pp. 2338-9).
8. FLOOD CONTROL. Received a Kans. Legislature memorial opposing Tuttle Creek Dam (p. 2344).
9. ADJOURNED until Wed., Mar. 25 (p. 2342).

BILLS INTRODUCED

10. WAR-RISK INSURANCE. S. 1413, by Sen. Maybank (for himself and Sen. Capehart), and H. R. 4147, by Rep. Brown (Ga.), to authorize the Export-Import Bank to make war-risk insurance available to exporters for the warehousing of cotton and other products in foreign countries pending sale; to Banking and Currency Committee (pp. 2263, 2343).
11. DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME. S. 1419, by Sen. Case, to permit the D. C. Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time this year and in the future; to D. C. Committee (p. 2263).
12. RECLAMATION. S. 1438, authorizing a dam and works on the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to Public Works Committee (p. 2263). Remarks of Sen. Malone, author (pp. 2294-5).
13. PRICING. H. R. 4170, by Rep. Walter, to define the application of the Clayton and FTC Acts to certain pricing practices; to Judiciary Committee (p. 2344).
14. PERSONNEL. H. R. 4148, by Rep. Broyhill, to repeal certain provisions which impose requirements and limitations with respect to appointments, promotions, and other personnel transactions in or outside the competitive civil service; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 2343).
15. FORESTRY. H. R. 4150, by Rep. Coon, providing that 5% of national forest receipts may be used by local government units for recreation resources; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2343).
16. FARM PROGRAM. H. R. 4157, by Rep. Hope, "to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949"; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2343).
17. FARM LOANS. H. R. 4158, by Rep. Horan, to extend for 5 years the authority of the Secretary to make RACC-type loans; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2343).
18. FLAMMABLE FABRICS. H. R. 4159, by Rep. Johnson, to prohibit interstate commerce in flammable fabrics; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 2343).
19. CROP INSURANCE. H. R. 4162, by Rep. Metcalf, to extend for 4 years the authority of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to expand its coverage into additional counties; to Agriculture Committee (p. 2343).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

20. LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY. Sen. Schoepel inserted the report and recommendations to the Secretary, of the Livestock Industry Conference Committee as adopted by the Kansas Livestock Association (pp. A1537-8).

against human problems of security and survival. They are old-age and survivors insurance and public assistance.

Old-age and survivors insurance, by building up protection against loss of family income through old age or death, contributes not only to the stability of our economy but provides many millions of American citizens with a minimum security that contributes immeasurably to individual happiness, well-being, and, I have no doubt, as well to our general productivity.

Old-age and survivors insurance benefits need, of course, to be extended to many more hundreds of thousands of our working population. I am glad to note that the President contemplates submitting legislation designed to broaden the present social-security program. With our rapidly aging population, old-age security has become an increasingly serious national problem.

It seems clear to me that the creation of a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should give added impetus to such legislation and, by strengthening the hand of the present Federal Security Administrator, aid materially in the administration of such an extended program.

I am sure that no one will challenge the thought that the children of this country are our greatest national asset.

The new Department will continue to include the Children's Bureau, which, since its founding in 1912, has concerned itself with the health and welfare of our children. Some of its booklets, like *Infant Care* and *Your Child From One To Six*, have been read and pondered in hundreds of thousands of American homes and have aided millions of parents in rearing their children.

The great work of helping the States to furnish medical treatment to crippled children and of aiding children who lack real homes or who are neglected by their parents is surely one of the most important investments that we can make in the future of America.

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, another unit of the proposed new Department, cooperates with the States in the vocational training and placement of the physically handicapped. This program—directly affecting human beings—will gain strength through the creation of a Department of Health, Education, and Security.

So, in my opinion, will the Food and Drug Administration, which protects American families by safeguarding the purity of our food, medicines, and cosmetics. With the Public Health Service, the Food and Drug Administration gives health protection to the millions of American consumers and contributes materially to the security and well-being of the American family.

The importance of the work of the Federal Security Agency—which will be carried on, and, I have no doubt, in the course of time will be strengthened by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—can perhaps be illustrated by a few figures.

Figures and statistics, in their own right, are cold. I would ask that we

think of these figures in terms of people and of our human resources.

Think what it means in these terms when we make note of the fact that 4 out of 5 American jobs now have social-security protection and more than 5 million people are drawing monthly benefits under the system.

When we speak of public assistance, let us think what that term means to nearly 5 million persons—the needy blind, needy aged, dependent children, and the needy disabled who are benefitting from this agency program.

Leadership and guidance is being given, through the States, to some 28 million children enrolled in our elementary and secondary schools, including 3 million high school students in vocational education classes who receive direct aid from the Federal Government.

Think of the importance that this program takes on for the children and the parents of the children who benefit each day from their Government's interest in education.

Every buyer of every drug and every one living under the health protections afforded by these programs is a witness to their Government's day-to-day efforts to produce a healthier, happier, and more productive America.

These are examples, and only examples, of statistical measurement of the work of this agency. The roots of these programs go deep, into the thousands of small towns and communities throughout the land. Their influence is felt by Americans in the farthest corners of the Nation.

This fact alone leads me to endorse the present proposal.

I am happy to support this bill to create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry on the job of conserving and strengthening our human resources.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 28, 35, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 21, 23, 26,

29, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 45, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for 'Capitol Buildings', \$800."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", to remain available until expended, \$13,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted by the Act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert:

"THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, \$50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 42.

STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CLIFF CLEVINGER,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to inquire whether the Democratic managers on the part of the Senate signed the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] signed it. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was not in town. However, he was present at the conference that was held today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder whether I should notify the senior Senator from Arizona—

Mr. BRIDGES. All of us agreed on the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is not quite clear in the report what provision was made for rural electrification and for the rural telephone program. I wonder whether the Senator from New Hampshire would give an explanation of it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the question has been asked, because the distinguished Senator from North Dakota also asked me with reference to it.

When the bill came to the Senate from the House of Representatives, there was no provision contained in it for either rural electrification or for the rural telephone program. The Senate, after hearings, and getting a budget estimate from the present Budget Director, deducted \$15 million from the REA and gave it to the rural telephone program. Therefore, when the bill went to conference, it contained this addition by the Senate.

Then in the conference, where we had to reach a compromise, we reduced REA electrification funds by \$15 million, but provided for only \$10 million additional for the rural telephone program; in other words, in effect we rescinded \$5 million of REA authorization.

So when the conference report went to the House for action, the reduction of \$15 million in REA authority and the \$10 million increase in telephone authority were rejected.

On two record votes, the House rejected both the conference compromise proposal and an amendment to increase the telephone program authority without a reduction in electrification authority.

Today the conferees on the part of the Senate met and reached a decision. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was present at our meeting today, as was the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; and at the meeting we decided unanimously to instruct the chairman of the committee to move that the Senate agree to the report and recede from the amendment on the part of the Senate, for the reason that the House had voted so decisively on the matter. This subject can be acted upon in a coming appropriation bill at a time when there is opportunity to explore it fully. Another reason for prompt action at this time, is that the measure before us carries appropriations for various Senate special committees and their employees, which will be without funds unless this supplement appropriation bill is acted upon very soon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it the intention of the distinguished chairman of the committee and of other members of the conference to have considered, in connection with the next supplemental appropriation bill, the needs of those interested in rural telephones and the needs of others who have made application in an attempt to meet such needs?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; to do so in the one which comes first, either the regular appropriation bill or the supplemental

bill; and I have so informed the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], who was one of the most ardent proponents of the telephone matter.

Mr. LEHMAN. So was I.

Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. In view of the fact that the House rejected the two amendments which were adopted by the Senate, what is the present status of the contingent fund for rural electrification?

Mr. BRIDGES. There is no change; it returns to its former status.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. According to the conference report, the conferees on the part of the Senate receded from Senate amendment numbered 39; and according to the statement on the part of the managers for the House, that amendment would appropriate \$1,000,000 for grants to the Republic of the Philippines, as proposed by the House of Representatives.

The chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee will recall that during the discussion of the proposed amendment with members of the committee, it was decided that because of the inadequacy of the information available to the committee at that time, action should be deferred until additional information could be made available by the Bureau of the Budget. Does the chairman of the committee recall that discussion?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, I do. I may say that in the interim the new Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, sent up a budget justification, together with a request and a statement that the appropriation item was urgently needed. That occurred in the interim period between the Senate action and the conference with the House.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure I had no information which would indicate that the Bureau of the Budget was satisfied. I merely wish to point out that I have heard many rumors that—regardless of whether this matter is under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration or comes under the provisions of the act—the Republic of the Philippines has absolute authority for supervising this hospitalization program. I am serving notice that before the regular appropriation bill for 1954 is acted upon, I shall demand some information on that subject.

I may point out for the information of the chairman of the committee that I have before me a clipping from the Philippine Free Press of Manila, dated January 31, 1953, with the heading "Hospitalization Racket." I am sure that if the chairman of the committee will read this brief article he will agree with me that there is reason for doubt and suspicion on the part of the Appropriations Committee as to the desirability of this particular program.

As I have said, I do not know whether we have any jurisdiction or any authority, or whether the Veterans' Administration is compelled by law merely to transfer the funds, to be expended by the Republic of the Philippines.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the article under the heading "Hospitalization Racket."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOSPITALIZATION RACKET

(By Filemon V. Tutay)

When investigators of the Police Affairs Division of the Philippine Constabulary first went to the Vis Medicatrix Naturae Clinic in Malabon, Rizal, sometime last October, they never suspected that they would stumble upon a complicated racket involving hospital benefits for war veterans. The constabulary agents were assigned by Capt. Jose del Rosario merely to check on reports that some patients at the clinic had the dangerous habit of firing their firearms inside the hospital when they got drunk. But in the process of investigation the agents found that many of the ailing war veterans, recorded as "in" on the charts of the clinic and supposed to be receiving medical treatment were somewhere else. They were not in the hospital.

One veteran who appeared in the records as a patient in the hospital turned out actually to be attending his classes in the College of Agriculture of the University of the Philippines in Los Baños, Laguna. In consideration for the use of their names on the hospital charts, the "absentee patients" received monthly allowances out of what the hospital collected for their supposed subsistence and medicines from the Philippine Veterans' Board.

When the agents submitted their report, their findings on the original complaint about the illegal discharge of firearms were ignored, while the portion of the report relating to the racket was immediately attended to. Lt. Col. Hospicio Tuazon, the new chief of the Police Affairs Division, ordered more men to work on the case. One team of agents was assigned to a round-the-clock surveillance of the V. M. N. clinic while another team was charged with gathering evidence on the illegal activities of the director.

After more than a month of intensive investigation, the constabulary operatives were able to assemble evidence sufficiently strong to warrant positive action. A raiding party was organized and just before noon on December 11, last, a strong force of agents with a security screen of heavily armed troops descended upon the suspected hospital. The raiders seized a large quantity of incriminating documents, including receipts for various sums allegedly received by patients from Dr. Alberto Bañas, owner, manager, and director of the clinic.

As established by the findings of the agents, the racket was operated in this manner. Under the Rogers Act, a war veteran certified as sick and therefore entitled to hospital benefits under the act, is authorized to collect ₱10 a day for subsistence and another ₱10 for his medical needs in accordance with the prescriptions of his physician. This provision proved a strong attraction to certain unscrupulous individuals. Veterans are made to appear as patients in a hospital, duly authorized by the Philippine Veterans Board to accept veteran patients, although actually they may be in their own homes in another part of the country.

At the end of each month, the hospital collected from the PVB the equivalent of the patients' subsistence and medicines, amounting to ₱600 a month per patient. (The PVB

in turn collected from the United States Veterans' Administration.) From this amount, the absentee patient got his cut of ₱65 or more for doing nothing. But when some patients discovered that the hospitals were raking in profits of from ₱400 to ₱535 a month per patient, they demanded a bigger share. It was then that some of the smarter absentee patients were given a substantial increase in their allowances. Some patients, it was learned, collected as much as ₱200 a month for the use of their names on hospital charts.

To add to their cut some of the more enterprising patients acted as agents to contact veterans who might be in the provinces and not familiar with the racket. The later came to Manila only to sign some papers and signify their intention to take advantage of the hospital benefits offered in the Rogers Act. Then they returned to their own homes in the provinces and waited for their monthly allowance. Before the allowance was sent, however, the agents first deducted their commission, usually ₱20 to ₱40 a month.

At this writing, three criminal cases for estafa through falsification of public documents have been filed against Dr. Bañas, of the VMN clinic. In one case, he has already been convicted by Judge Bienvenido A. Tan of the Court of First Instance of Rizal, and sentenced to 4 years and 1 day in prison, and to pay a fine of ₱5,000. In imposing the sentence, Judge Tan said: "The court * * * could not fail to consider the fact that the act committed by the accused in this case is not only illegal but repugnant to the conscience of all law-abiding citizens, because it diverts the funds destined to destitute veterans for their invaluable services to their country as a partial token of appreciation of a grateful people, to serve the selfish interest of heartless individuals." Bañas appealed the decision. He stands charged in two similar cases before the Court of First Instance at Pasig.

Constabulary authorities believe that they have hardly scratched the surface of the racket. They are confident that numerous other estafa cases will be developed from the findings of government investigators. This will require the services of a special prosecutor to handle nothing else but cases involving the hospitalization racket. For this special assignment, Secretary of Justice Oscar Castelo designated Assistant Provincial Fiscal Jose Castillo, of Rizal, because of his familiarity with the background of the racket. Castillo handled the successful prosecution of the first case against Bañas.

In order to be better prepared for the job, Fiscal Castillo accompanied the constabulary agents when they raided the clinic of Dr. Jesus Crisologo in Quezon City on January 8. Here, as in the hospital of Dr. Bañas, the constabulary found telltale signs of irregularities and the raiders seized documentary evidence in the form of hospital charts and other papers.

The hospital of Dr. Crisologo was under contract with the Philippine Veterans Board to treat 30 veterans. At the time of the raid, however, 15 of the patients were out on pass. This was a violation of the provisions of the contract which limited pass leaves to 10 percent of the number of patients under treatment. Under the contract, only three patients could be out of the hospital at any one time.

As a result of the raid, constabulary authorities issued an alarm for the apprehension of Guerrilla "Col." Justiniano Estrella, who was suspected of having connived with the hospital director in committing irregularities. Constabulary agents were able to intercept letters written by Estrella to other veterans persuading them to be hospitalized at the Crisologo clinic as a means of making money without having to work for it.

On the strength of evidence gathered by the constabulary, an information similar to that filed against Dr. Bañas has been filed before the Court of First Instance in Quezon City charging Dr. Crisologo with the crime of estafa through falsification of public documents. "Colonel" Estrella was named as coaccused in the case.

About 1 week following the raid in Quezon City, constabulary investigators swooped down on a clinic in Cavite City owned and operated by Dr. Rizalina Bautista-Poblete and her husband, Dr. Juan Poblete. Guerrilla Capt. Bienvenido Santos furnished the intelligence report which led to the raid. He complained to constabulary officials that while he was treated at the clinic for only a few days, it was made to appear in the records of the hospital that he was under treatment for long periods.

In a statement made before investigators of the constabulary and the United States Veterans' Administration, Santos alleged that he entered the Poblete clinic on May 8, 1952, but left the following day. He returned to the clinic on July 5, 1952, stayed for a while, and then left again. He came back every now and then, but never stayed in the clinic as a regular patient. During the intervals between his visits to the clinic, he said that he was never given any pass or furlough. He was not administered any treatment unless he went to the hospital, contrary to the records on his case.

The clinic of the Pobletes was under contract with the Philippine Veterans Board to treat 148 war veterans. This is probably the largest number of patients allowed any single hospital of the 34 under contract with the PVB. At this writing (Tuesday) cases, similar to those filed against Dr. Bañas and Dr. Crisologo, were still under study for filing against the operators of the Cavite City Clinic.

According to the findings of constabulary investigators, certain officials and employees of the Philippine Veterans Board will probably be involved before the whole mess is cleared up. It is pointed out that agents of the racketeering hospitals found no trouble in having the papers of applicants for hospitalization under the Rogers Act approved promptly by simply dealing with these officials and employees. Hospital owners have also complained that they could not collect from the PVB unless they shelled out to these mulcters. In making their collections for the hospitalization of war veterans, the hospital operators do not deal directly with the Manila office of the United States Veterans' Administration, which administers the Rogers hospitalization benefits to Filipino veterans, but with the PVB, which in turn collects from the USVA.

In this connection, it is significant to note that Maj. Gen. Guillermo B. Francisco, acting chairman of the Philippine Veterans Board, has asked for the investigation of PVB personnel reported to have enriched themselves in office. In his letter to Senator Lorenzo M. Tañada, chairman of the Senate Blue Ribbon Committee, General Francisco said that some PVB officials and employees have been reported to him as living beyond their legitimate means as government officials.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who is an ardent champion of economy and is also an ardent champion of what is right, that he has very ample grounds for making the statement he has made. However, none of the \$1 million conferred in this bill will go for construction of hospitals; it is exclusively for medical expenses of veterans. When the regular Independent Offices appropriation bill comes along, there

will be an opportunity to look into the matter; and it is the intention of the chairman of the committee to see that this matter is gone into completely and thoroughly. I believe the Senator from Idaho is absolutely correct in the position he takes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the chairman of the committee. I have absolutely no reason to oppose any appropriation in implementation of funds for the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of veterans of World War II.

On the other hand, there is evidence that there have been abuses and exploitation, and that the veterans of the Republic of the Philippines who are intended to be the beneficiaries of this program are becoming the innocent victims of a hospitalization racket. Certainly it is our business to investigate before we make the appropriations for the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3053, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
March 19, 1953.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 30, 31, 32, and 42 to the bill (H. R. 3053) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "\$28,000,000" in said amendment, insert "\$24,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "Provided, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed by the Department of Defense on Federal property, other than in the District of Columbia, situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to payments under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to such children in the same manner as if such Federal property were situated in the same State as such agency."

That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24 and 27, and that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 33.

The motion was agreed to.

CASUALTIES IN KOREA—CONTINUATION OF TRADE BETWEEN WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND RUSSIA AND SATELLITE COUNTRIES—35,520 DEAD, NEARLY 500,000 INJURED, NOT INCLUDING LAST 15 MONTHS' NONBATTLE CASUALTIES.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, an Associated Press dispatch published today, dated at Seoul, Korea, on March 20, states, in part:

KOREA WAR BACK WHERE IT BEGAN ON 1,000TH DAY—TROOPS FIGHT ON IN FOG AND 2 INCHES OF RAIN

SEOUL, KOREA, March 20.—Today is the 1,000th day of the costly, inconclusive Korean war with the battle line in the middle of the Asiatic peninsula. That's just about where the boundary was when North Korean troops invaded South Korea to start the war June 25, 1950.

I also have before me a dispatch by the Chicago Tribune Press Service, from New York, on March 20, reading in part as follows:

CANADIAN U. N. GROUP AFFIRMS "SOFT" RED POLICY

(By Chesly Manly)

NEW YORK, March 20.—Canada's delegation to the United Nations today reaffirmed its policy of conciliating the Soviet Union, whose veto in the security council is the sole obstacle to the appointment of Lester B. Pearson, Canada's external affairs minister, as secretary general of the U. N.

Mr. President, a dispatch dated about March 4 said that when Russia was charged with trading with and sending war materials to Communist China, that Russia had said that of course she was sending such war materials to Communist China under a mutual assistance security pact with Communist China.

At that time—March 6—the junior Senator from Nevada inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the controlling paragraph of the pact between Russia and Communist China, reading: "The high contracting parties (Russia and China) agree to afford one another all possible economic assistance in the post-war period."

ENGLAND-RUSSIA MUTUAL ASSISTANCE PACT

He also placed the corresponding paragraph of the mutual security pact between England and Russia in the record, reading:

The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

Ten or 12 years are yet to run on those pacts.

FRANCE-RUSSIA MUTUAL SECURITY PACT

The corresponding paragraph of the mutual security pact between France and Russia was also placed in the RECORD on March 6, reading:

The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war.

These are independent pacts, and all of them are in good standing with no indication that either party to such pacts intends to ask for relief.

THE ATLANTIC MUTUAL SECURITY PACT

I also placed in the RECORD the corresponding paragraph of the mutual se-

curity pact—the Atlantic Pact—between the United States and 11 European nations, including France and Britain—reading in part: "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them, to promote conditions of stability and well being, and to encourage economic collaboration."

Of course it is well known and understood that Britain has recognized Communist China to preserve and maintain her trade as usual between Singapore and Hong Kong and Communist China.

SURROUNDED BY MUTUAL SECURITY PACTS

Mr. President, we are entirely surrounded with mutual security pacts. Also we were served due notice of the avowed intentions of England and France to trade with Russia and other Iron Curtain countries.

There is also the information, which now is reliably reported, and no longer denied, that Britain has continually sent tin, rubber, and manufactured goods from Hong Kong and Singapore into Communist China, and that such shipments continue to be made.

NEARLY 100 TRADE PACTS

We also know and have known from the beginning of the Marshall plan aid that the 17 Marshall plan European nations continue to trade with Russia and the satellite nations, with whom they have approximately 100 separate and distinct trade pacts, including sending just about everything to any potential enemy that Russia needs to fight world war III with us.

THIRTY-TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND TWENTY DEAD—NEARLY 500,000 INJURED—NOT INCLUDING THE LAST 15 MONTHS' NEW BATTLE CASUALTIES

It is well-known and recognized that there are but a token number of troops from the European nations fighting with the United States troops in Korea.

Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD a tabulation to and including March 18, 1953. The number of men killed in action to be 23,209—23,209 troops, mostly American; missing, assumed to be dead, 223; missing, with no knowledge on the part of the Defense Department as to where these men are—men about whom little doubt is entertained that they are dead—9,088; prisoners of war, 2,305; wounded in action, 95,246.

A total Mr. President, including killed in action, missing, and assumed to be dead, and missing, with present whereabouts unknown and with no other available information, a total of 32,520.

The record for nonbattle hospitalized injuries the first 18 months of the war—July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1951—totaled 401,628, of whom 3,340 died of such injuries.

I ask unanimous consent to have this table placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To March 18, 1953

| | |
|----------------------|--------|
| Killed in action | 23,209 |
| Missing (dead) | 223 |
| Missing (don't know) | 9,088 |

32,520

| | |
|---|---------|
| Prisoners of war | 2,305 |
| Wounded in action | 95,246 |
| Men wounded and injured—nonbattle, injuries July 1, 1950-Dec. 31, 1951—first 18 months of the war | 401,628 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| Men who died as a result of nonbattle injuries | 3,340 |
|--|-------|

| | |
|---|--------|
| Total dead or missing (don't know where they are) | 35,860 |
|---|--------|

NON-BATTLE-HOSPITALIZED INJURED FROM JANUARY 1, 1952, TO MARCH 18, 1953

Mr. MALONE. The National Defense Office was unable to give me the number of hospitalized injured and the number of deaths resulting from such injuries for the last 15 months of the "police action" in Korea.

I have been told that these figures will be available within a few days and will be furnished me.

DEATHS AND INJURIES—BATTLE AND NONBATTLE

Mr. President, I call attention again to the fact that the total deaths, as a result of this war, can be presumed to be 35,860 as of March 18, 1953.

There are, Mr. President, 95,246 injured in battle to and including March 18, 1953, and that there are 401,628 additional men classified as nonbattle-hospitalized injured up to December 31, 1951. The number of nonbattle-hospitalized injured from December 31, 1951, to March 18, 1953, is yet to be reported—also the number of deaths resulting from such injuries.

FURTHER INFORMATION FORTHCOMING

Mr. President, these figures were just secured from the Secretary of National Defense Public Relations Office. Within a few days, I am promised the data, the number of nonbattle casualties from January 1, 1952, to March 18, 1953. They could give me no information now.

I have been told they do not have these figures compiled, but that they will have them within a few days, and I promise the Senate a full report when I receive them. I think it can safely be assumed that, since there were many more men fighting during the past 16 months than there were during the first 18 months, that the nonbattle casualties will be at least equally high.

Mr. President, I now desire to introduce a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

BRIDGE CANYON DAM AND INCIDENTAL WORKS IN MAIN STREAM OF COLORADO RIVER JUST ABOVE LAKE MEAD—THE LOWER BASIN STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, located just above Lake Mead formed by Hoover Dam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1438) authorizing the construction.

Public Law 11 - 83d Congress
Chapter 12 - 1st Session
H. R. 3053

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953,
and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, namely:

Second Sup-
plemental
Appropriation
Act,
1953.

CHAPTER I

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

For payment to Rosemary T. McMahon, widow of Brien McMahon, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, \$12,500.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Florida, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than three million but less than five million, the population of said State having exceeded three million inhabitants. 66 Stat. 464.

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of New Jersey, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than five million but less than ten million, the population of said State having exceeded five million inhabitants. 67 Stat. 8.
67 Stat. 9.
66 Stat. 464.

Office of the Secretary: Effective March 1, 1953, the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953 is made available for the compensation of one camera and sound engineer, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of \$4,080 per annum, and one shipping clerk, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of \$1,500 per annum. 66 Stat. 464.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Joint Committee on Printing: For an additional amount for salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing, at rates to be fixed by the committee, \$555.

Vice President's automobile: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, \$980.

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for "Expenses of inquiries and investigations", \$500,000.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Ona Stigler, widow of William G. Stigler, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, \$12,500.

For payment to Mae Ruth Sabath, widow of Adolph J. Sabath, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, \$12,500.

For payment to Grace Hill Cox, widow of Eugene E. Cox, late a Representative from the State of Georgia, \$12,500.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Clerk: For an additional amount for the "Office of the Clerk", \$3,835 to be available for the compensation of one editor and laboratory supervisor, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of \$4,020 per annum, and one script writer and general secretary, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of \$2,500 per annum, Joint Recording Facility.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

Furniture: For an additional amount for "Furniture", \$58,750, to remain available until June 30, 1954, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation, "Contingent expenses, House of Representatives, furniture, 1952", is hereby made available until June 30, 1954.

Special and select committees: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of special and select committees authorized by the House, \$500,000.

Stationery (revolving fund): For an additional amount for "Stationery (revolving fund)", for the first session of the Eighty-third Congress, \$800, to remain available until expended.

67 Stat. 9.

67 Stat. 10.

Automobiles for majority and minority leaders: Funds appropriated for "Contingent expenses of the House" are hereby made available for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, repair, and operation of two automobiles, one for the majority leader of the House, and one for the minority leader of the House.

EDUCATION OF SENATE AND HOUSE PAGES

For an additional amount for Education of Senate, House, and Supreme Court pages, \$2,570.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS

Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings", \$800.

Senate Restaurant: For repairs, improvements, furnishings and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Capitol Building, including personal and other services, \$1,600, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

41 USC 5.

Senate Office Building: For an additional amount for "Senate Office Building", \$54,000.

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PREPARATION OF RULES FOR CIVIL PROCEDURE

For expenses of the Supreme Court incident to proposed amendments or additions to the rules of civil procedure for the United States

district courts pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2072, 62 Stat. 961. to be expended as the Chief Justice in his discretion may approve, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses for subsistence at rates to be fixed by him not to exceed \$10 per day, \$11,500, to remain available until June 30, 1954.

OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount for "Fees of commissioners", \$107,000.

FEES OF JURORS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors", \$200,000.

MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous salaries", \$20,600.

SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

For an additional amount for "Salaries of court reporters", \$15,700. 67 Stat. 10.
67 Stat. 11.

SALARIES OF REFEREES

For an additional amount for "Salaries of referees", \$134,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall be available for payment of the salaries of referees at the increased rates authorized by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1952, effective as of October 1, 1952.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$1,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "International Information and Educational Activities", Department of State Appropriation Act, 1953. 66 Stat. 553.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Attorney General is hereby authorized to transfer from appropriations contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, not to exceed \$270,000 to the appropriation "Fees and expenses of witnesses, Justice", 1953, and not to exceed \$600,000 to the appropriation "Support of United States prisoners, Federal prison system", 1953. 66 Stat. 556.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR-NAVIGATION FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Establishment of air-navigation facilities", \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM, FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

60 Stat. 170. For an additional amount for "Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act", for liquidation of obligations incurred under
49 USC authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts,
1101 note. \$3,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1955.

PATENT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$130,000.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

67 Stat. 11. For an additional amount for "Federal-aid highways", to remain
67 Stat. 12. available until expended, \$185,000,000, which sum is composed of
\$72,500,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, and \$112,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1952.

ACCESS ROADS (ACT OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1950)

64 Stat. 791. For an additional amount for "Access roads (Act of September 7,
23 USC 1950)", to remain available until expended, \$13,000,000, of which
106 note. \$8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the
23 USC contract authority granted by the Act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat.
106 note. 422).

CHAPTER III

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", \$750,000.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

POSTAL OPERATIONS

66 Stat. 293. For an additional amount for "Postal operations", \$24,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953.

CLAIMS

For an additional amount for "Claims", \$300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953. 66 Stat. 293.

CHAPTER IV

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$80,000.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration", \$6,750,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available for expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684).

38 USC
991-999.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS

67 Stat. 12.
67 Stat. 13.

For payments to unemployed veterans as authorized by title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 684), \$27,200,000, to remain available until June 30, 1954.

38 USC
991-999.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$150,000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Economic Stabilization Agency, 1953" and \$50,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Mexican Farm Labor Program, 1953", to remain available until July 31, 1953: *Provided*, That these funds shall be utilized solely for the continuation through June 1953 of a consumer price index upon the same basis employed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in compiling such an index for the period prior to January 1, 1953.

66 Stat. 657.

66 Stat. 641.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount for "Payments to school districts", \$20,500,000: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed by the Department of Defense on Federal property, other than in the District of Columbia, situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to payments

64 Stat. 1102.
20 USC 238.

under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, with respect to such children in the same manner as if such Federal property were situated in the same State as such agency.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

66 Stat. 368.

The amount authorized by the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1953, to be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance", is increased from "\$60,500,000" to "\$62,500,000".

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance", \$340,000,000.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

66 Stat. 371.

67 Stat. 13.

67 Stat. 14.

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses", National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.

ARBITRATION AND EMERGENCY BOARDS

66 Stat. 371.

For an additional amount for "Arbitration and emergency boards", \$10,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses", National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

66 Stat. 371.

The amount made available under this head in the National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1953, exclusively for compensation and expenses of referees is decreased from "\$216,000" to "\$199,000".

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RESEARCH IN THE UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

For an additional amount for "Research in the utilization of saline water", \$50,000.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", \$60,000.

BUREAU OF MINES

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Health and safety", \$266,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available for the purchase of fifty passenger motor vehicles in addition to those heretofore provided. 66 Stat. 454.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$20,000. 60 Stat. 810.

CHAPTER VII

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", including employment without regard to the civil-service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, \$50,000.

67 Stat. 14.

EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

67 Stat. 15.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

For an additional amount for "Emergency fund for the President, national defense", \$250,000.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

INVESTIGATIONS OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422, approved January 9, 1953, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, \$1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "International Information and Educational Activities", Department of State Appropriation Act, 1953: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be apportioned for use pursuant to Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, prior to April 1, 1953: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order. 18 FR 239. 66 Stat. 553. 31 USC 665.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

66 Stat. 407,
645. The limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, as amended by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, on the amount available for expenses of travel, is hereby increased from "\$1,648,275" to "\$1,800,000".

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATION, MEDICAL, HOSPITAL, AND DOMICILIARY SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services", \$10,000,000.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", \$237,573,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SERVICEMEN'S INDEMNITIES

67 Stat. 15. For an additional amount for "Servicemen's indemnities",
67 Stat. 16. \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS' MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Veterans' miscellaneous benefits", \$1,361,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For an additional amount for "Grants to the Republic of the Philippines", \$1,000,000.

REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF

The appropriation heretofore granted for "Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief" is hereby reduced by the sum of \$1,000,000, and said amount shall be carried to the surplus of the Treasury.

CHAPTER VIII

CIVIL FUNCTIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

66 Stat. 582. Not to exceed \$15,000 of the amount appropriated under this head in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953, for construction and major equipment, shall be available for payment to the Republic of Panama for an expansion of its Colon sewage disposal facilities to serve the Canal Zone.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

The amount made available under this head in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953, for general and administrative expenses of the Panama Canal Company, is hereby increased from "\$3,301,800" to "\$3,557,000". 66 Stat. 582.

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY FUNCTIONS

For additional amounts for the following appropriations of not to exceed the amounts stated:

"Claims", Department of Defense, \$1,000,000;
 "Retired pay", Department of Defense, \$25,000,000;
 "Military personnel, Army", \$725,724,000;
 "Military personnel, Navy", \$140,000,000;
 "Military personnel, Marine Corps", \$63,000,000;
 "Military personnel requirements", Department of the Air Force, \$15,000,000; the foregoing amounts under this heading to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation during the fiscal year 1953 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

67 Stat. 16.

67 Stat. 17.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Marine Corps troops and facilities, 1951" shall remain available during the fiscal year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder for procurement of ordnance, ammunition, and other military equipment. 64 Stat. 744.

SHIPS AND FACILITIES

The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Ships and facilities, 1951" shall remain available during the fiscal year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder for procurement of electronics equipment. 64 Stat. 745.

ORDNANCE AND FACILITIES

The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Ordnance and facilities, 1951" shall remain available during the fiscal year 1954 for liquidation of obligations incurred thereunder for (1) production and procurement of Navy ordnance and ammunition and (2) procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools. 64 Stat. 745.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

Of the appropriation granted under this head in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, \$1,685,044,000 shall be used to complete the liquidation of all obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted under this head to enter into contracts. 66 Stat. 528.

CHAPTER X

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document Numbered 19, Eighty-third Congress, \$13,230,038, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

CHAPTER XI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Strikes or
overthrow
of Govern-
ment.

67 Stat. 17.
67 Stat. 18.

Affidavit.

Penalty.

SEC. 1101. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 1102. This Act may be cited as the "Second Supplemental Short title. Appropriation Act, 1953".

Approved March 28, 1953.

